

# The Southern Speech Journal

VOL. XIV

SEPTEMBER, 1948

No. 1

## A MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

CHARLES MCGLOM

*Southern Baptist Theological Seminary*

It is a pleasure to extend greetings to all members of the Southern Speech Association and to our friends who share this issue of the *Journal* with us. I am sure that I express the happiness of every officer of the Association over the expanded *Journal* that Dr. Dickey has herewith presented you. It is the desire not only of the officers but of the total membership that every activity of the Southern Speech Association be as successfully expanded during the 1948-1949 life of the organization.

Now that the Southern Speech Association is in its nineteenth year, the purposes of the organization become quite clear with the maturity that it has attained. Perhaps the main objective of a professional organization such as ours should be the building of an *esprit de corps* among its members. It was obvious to those who attended the Convention last April in Nashville that the organization has gone a long way in achieving this objective. The thing all of us need to do during the current year is to foster the further development of this feeling of fellowship, mutual interest, and professional helpfulness in every way possible.

Another important objective of the Southern Speech Association should be the encouragement of professional growth on the part of every person and institution connected with the organization. Some of our state organizations have made commendable progress in furthering this objective. It is true that requirements and regulations established by Departments of Speech and Departments of Education can foster this spirit of growth and improvement more hurriedly than can the Southern Speech Association. However, the organization can seize upon every opportunity to give direction or to lend encouragement to every Department improving its standards.

It perhaps should be stated here that some members of the organization have recently expressed a desire that a freer distribution of information from Departments that have successfully promoted programs of progress be made available to membership in order that all of us might be stimulated to make like progress. In this connection Dr. J. Dale Welsh of Mississippi State College for Women has been appointed to head a Committee on Speech in the

Elementary Schools. Many of you will have suggestions to make to Dr. Welsch about a proposed curriculum for the improvement of the training of teachers of speech for elementary schools. It is both your opportunity and your responsibility to correspond with him about this matter.

A second movement related to this same objective is the matter of compiling information, particularly in the fields of Drama, Debate, and Interpretation for teachers of speech in the high schools. Miss Betty May Collins is Vice-President of the Association in charge of promotional work among our Southern high schools. It is her responsibility to share materials that come into her hands with all high school teachers who are members of the Association. Perhaps you have a suggested list of appropriate, tested, successful high school plays that you should send to Miss Collins. Perhaps you have suggestions for Debate materials, or for the proper conduct of poetry-reading contests in your school that Miss Collins should know about and distribute among the membership.

The next important objective of the Southern Speech Association is the conduct of the Tournament, Congress, and Convention. It is apparent again to those who attended the last meeting in Nashville that great heights were reached under the direction of last year's officers. Certainly Dr. Hale, Dr. Eubank, and Mrs. Hunt should be commended again and again for the success of the program in Nashville.

You might be interested in what has been done up to this time about the meeting scheduled for Waco, Texas, the week of April 4, 1949. It was the consensus of the Executive Committee that sectional meetings should be continued. Under the concept that sectional chairmen ought to operate annually rather than on a basis of the Convention only, the following have been appointed and will no doubt welcome your suggestions for the sessions they are scheduling. Dr. Paul Soper of the University of Tennessee is the chairman of the section on Speech Education. Dr. Joseph Wetherby of Duke University is chairman of the Radio committee. Mrs. W. W. Davison of the Davison School of Speech in Atlanta, Georgia, is in charge of the section on Speech Correction and Hearing. Dr. Charles M. Getchell of the University of Mississippi is responsible for the sessions on Interpretation. Dr. Waldo Braden of Louisiana State University is heading up the sessions on Rhetoric and Public Speaking. Dr. Dallas Dickey is in charge of graduate school representatives at the Convention. Dr. T. Earle Johnson of the University of Alabama is responsible for all the commercial exhibits that the Association will sponsor during the week of the Waco meetings. Dr. Lester Hale of the University of Florida has agreed to "plan and execute" a repetition of the informal fun night that "went over so big" at Nashville. Other committee chairmen are in the process of being appointed. Will you not

feel free to write your president concerning any sectional meeting about which you are personally quite concerned?

You might be interested in a further statement about some of the details of the program for Waco. The special meeting held on the Wednesday preceding the opening of the Convention that was devoted entirely to Speech Correction and Hearing was most successful last year. The plan now is to devote the same day to Drama and to extend the week so that as much of Saturday as will be needed can be devoted to Speech Correction and Hearing. At this point you should know that plans are now underway to invite a committee from the Southern Speech Association who are also members of the American Educational Theater Association to have charge of the program for Drama. It seems advisable at this point to make no further statement upon the matter of the Drama meeting held in North Carolina following the Convention in Nashville until your president reports to you in Waco.

A statement of what has been done to assure a successful meeting in Waco could not be completed without a word of appreciation to Miss Sara Lowrey, Chairman of the Department of Speech at Baylor University, who is in charge of local arrangements. A similar word of appreciation should go to Dr. Glenn Capp at Baylor who is serving specifically as local chairman for the Tournament and Congress, and to Dr. Paul Baker who is serving in the same capacity for Drama.

As a parting word, may your president prevail upon you, a member of the Southern Speech Association, to enlist at least one new member for the Association before Christmas? The greatest movements that have entailed the gaining of members in the history of our country have been those which operated on the slogan of "let one member win one new member." You can prove your real interest in the Association by making this principle true for our Speech Association.

## FREEDOM THROUGH EDUCATION

ATHENS C. PULLIAS

*President, David Lipscomb College*

On behalf of David Lipscomb College, and the city of Nashville, I would like to take this opportunity to welcome you to our city which we fondly refer to as "The Athens of the South."<sup>1</sup> Nashville is an unusual city in many ways, and I do hope that you will have an opportunity to see the features that distinguish it while you are here. There are ten colleges and universities in Nashville though this city is only about 250,000 in population. Of these, three are for Negroes and the remainder are for whites. In addition to that, there are numerous trade and business schools which bring people from all over the nation to our city. It is said that if you meet ten people on the street in Nashville, one of them is a college student, and another one of them is connected with a college in some way or another. I doubt if there are many cities in the nation more vitally interested in education and in the general principles of education than this city of Nashville. So I think it is very appropriate that you come here, to "The Athens of the South," for this convention and we welcome you.

The people of America have so long taken freedom of speech, freedom of press, freedom of assembly, and freedom of worship for granted that it seldom occurs to the average citizen that it could be otherwise. There are numerous lands on the face of the earth where you would not dare to say what you have in your minds; where if you operated a newspaper, you would be afraid to print what you considered to be in order. You know that and the whole world knows it and, yet, the average American does not realize it or grasp its meaning. In this country anyone may assemble with his fellows for worship in any fashion that he may choose. The rest of us may not agree with him, but we would defend his right to do it to the end. We reserve the right to criticize each other, but we extend to our fellows the right to criticize us. In recent years, some people have said that the government was making some inroads upon the liberties of the private citizens, and if you try to build a building or operate a business you may conclude that some restraints are present. At times they are exceedingly aggravating. But when I listen to the

---

<sup>1</sup>This paper, together with the ones by Lester L. Hale, Edward J. Meeman, W. R. Courtenay, and Irving J. Lee, were read at the opening session of the eighteenth annual convention of The Southern Speech Association at the Maxwell House in Nashville Tennessee, April 8, 1948. With these papers is being published the convention dinner address of Rupert L. Cortright, President (1948) of The Speech Association of America, April 9, 1948.



radio and read the newspapers and see the things that have been said about Mr. Truman, and about the Congress, and even about our distinguished Supreme Court, I am sure that freedom of speech is uncurtailed in America up to the present time. If anybody could have said anything that has not been said, I do not know what it would have been. And yet, this is not bad except that it would be so easy for us to forget that the struggle to break the chains of slavery, oppression, and dictatorship which deny these basic freedoms to which we have become so accustomed, has been a long and costly struggle in terms of human life and suffering. Martyrs to freedom sleep in the soil of many lands and America must never forget that. It is painful to see the American government considering the possibility of supporting a dictator in Spain simply because, for the moment, it might be politically expedient to do so. Jefferson and all the host of others who symbolized freedom and liberty in our country would never sacrifice their love for these principles to gain a little advantage by making an alliance with some oppressor or dictator. America should remember that.

The word freedom, first of all, requires an accurate definition. Perhaps to many who have never known it, it means the right to do whatever one may please regardless of its effects on others. As a result, people who have been long enslaved seldom behave well when they are released from slavery. Those who have been reduced to bondage are not prepared for freedom when they obtain it. In our own country a little less than a hundred years ago, a vast group of people were set free. Now, I am a Southerner, and that to the manner born, but I am glad that slavery is gone. It was wrong and yet these people did not always conduct themselves wisely when they were released from slavery here in America. Many things were done wrong and that is not surprising. They had no experience in the exercise of freedom. They had no knowledge of what it meant to accept the responsibilities that go with freedom. And that is something we must never forget. Freedom requires the acceptance of responsibility to maintain it for those who have it if they expect to maintain it. Those who consider freedom merely the opportunity to do what we please when we please may lose their own freedom by destroying the freedom of others. I am my brother's keeper in many senses of that word, but none more acutely than in the sense of freedom. As long as there is a slave on this earth, economic or otherwise, I am not entirely free. As long as there is a single person on the earth down under the dictator's heel, whether it be in Russia or in Spain, or anywhere else, I am not entirely free from the possibility of losing my freedom. Freedom is the right to live under God's laws in peaceful relationships with our fellow man. In this time when so much is being said about freedom, careful thought should be given

to an accurate definition. Freedom does not give me the right to interfere with your life and happiness, nor does it give you the right to interfere with mine. Too often, as in everything else, we want freedom for ourselves, liberties for ourselves, that we are unwilling to bestow on others. Lip service to the concept of freedom is no adequate substitute for giving men actual freedom of worship, freedom of press, freedom of speech, and freedom of assembly. It is interesting to see some of the comments coming out of Japan and I do not mean this as any criticism of General MacArthur. I think he was sufficiently humble yesterday or the day before. We believe in the principle of freedom of speech but we say it is not practical right now in Japan. We believe in the principle of freedom of speech but we say it is not practical just now in Germany. We believe in the overthrow of monarchs and no American citizen can hold a title of nobility, but just now we find it wise to support a corrupt and outmoded monarchy in Greece. I simply say that it is very easy for us to say that we believe in freedom, that we love freedom, that we want to be free, but then be unwilling to bestow upon others what we so ardently desire for ourselves. I am sure that it must be done if we are to maintain our liberties and our own freedom.

Now, the task of education is to set men free from the bonds of ignorance and superstition. The master teacher said, "The truth shall make you free." After all, ignorance is the world's greatest slave holder. There would not be a tyrant on earth, there would never again be the suppression of personal liberties if men would break the chains of ignorance, and if men knew the truth by which they would and could be made free. The shyster lawyer would find it impossible to prey upon the unfortunate in the courts and in our society if men had information, if they had the knowledge to reveal these shysters for what they are. The quack doctor would never again be able to enrich himself upon the anguish of the sick and dying if we were trained, if ignorance would be abolished and destroyed. The demagogue in religion would have to fold his tents and steal away if men knew the truth and understood it. Certainly the demagogue in politics who has flourished in our democracy, and I am sorry to say apparently he is flourishing still, here and there, would be shamed and cast out if only the truth could be known in every heart. The basic functions of education is to tell men the truth, as the lawyers put it, the whole truth and nothing but the truth. That is the task of education, to break the bonds of ignorance, to break the bonds of superstition, and to set men free under government.

However, the educator must remember that one cannot be free from the laws of God, but only under the laws of God. The scientist in his laboratory has the unlimited right of research that he may learn the truth, but he has no power to change the truth

that he may find. He is not a legislator. What is so often understood as a release from some age-old superstition or foolish belief is nothing more than the discovery by man of God given laws and principles that have been true since the beginning. Man sometimes feels himself wise to an unseemly degree when in reality he has only discovered the wisdom of the Creator of this universe. This principle applies in the spiritual and ethical realm just as it does in chemistry and in physics. There are eternal principles of truth and right which no man has the right to disregard. When you speak of freedom you do not mean the right to do what you please when you please regardless of man and regardless of divine law. You cannot be free from the law. You must be free under the law to work for the glory of God and the good of humanity.

That is another way of repeating the statement that freedom carries with it responsibility to learn and to respect the basic laws that govern this universe, the basic principles that must be the beacon lights of life. It is not, then, the function of higher education to fling a question mark of doubt at every tried principle of truth. Perhaps the Apostle Paul has laid down the scientific principle by which the educator is to proceed in his work of setting men free a little more accurately than anyone else: "Prove all things; hold fast to that which is good." Nothing should be accepted without investigation and study. On the other hand, nothing should be rejected hastily without careful study. Even those who work in the scientific realm are in danger of being swept off their feet by some fad or by something new and different that comes along. The exercise of freedom will require the careful analysis of every new suggestion, of every new idea, of every new step needed to determine whether it is in keeping with the infinite, and whether it promotes the good of mankind. I say it is not the function of higher education to fling a question mark at everything that is tried and proven. It is, instead, the function of education to attack ignorance everywhere in everything, to dispel it with truth, to uphold it with fact and with information, and to put knowledge in the hearts and in the minds of the common people that will enable them to live intelligently under the law and not to rebel foolishly against the law.

And when I say law, I do not refer to all the laws Congress has passed. I do not refer to our traffic ordinances which sometimes I find myself in collision with at the price of two, five, or ten dollars, depending on the circumstances. You have a right to rebel against the laws of man, that is, what human judgment has set up as law. But there are certain basic and eternal and fundamental principles of truth and right that govern this universe which no man can break, no man can successfully rebel against. He will only be broken in the attempt to do so. When you speak of freedom, never forget that the exercise of freedom requires the

acceptance of the responsibilities that go with it and the limitations that natural and divine law places upon it. We can not be free from the law. We can only be free under it to work for the glory of God and the good of humanity. Perfect freedom, then, lies in a clear understanding of God's eternal principles and laws in all things, and every man has the inalienable right to learn, to know, and to perform these principles. No man has the right to deny this knowledge to any human being.

Therefore, education should be extended to members of every race and to every people within the borders of our nation and to every people the world around. Democracy, liberty, freedom—all of the concepts that we count so dear—will depend at last upon the information that is put in the hearts and minds of the common man around the world, the common people in every land and in every nation. Freedom is not something to be carefully guarded by the intellectual few and handed out as a blessing to the many. It is a treasure which belongs to all mankind. The process of education is, in my judgment, the only road that will lead to perfect freedom. Perfect freedom is based on the recognition of the principles by which we live and accept the responsibilities that go with freedom. Therefore, none has the right to disregard the truth which is eternal and fundamental in the exercise of what we are pleased to call freedom. Freedom, then, is your right to live under the laws of God, natural and divine, for the glory of your Maker and for the good of your fellow man. Freedom must be extended to the people of every race and of every class and of every nation. We cannot reserve it as a special gift for ourselves without in time destroying the very thing we claim to love. Education, the destruction of ignorance, the breaking of the chains of superstition, the giving of full truth and light and information to all people everywhere will lead to peace, to democracy, and to prosperity. In this world of confusion, doubt, suspicion, and fear nothing will be more productive of human good than to promote true freedom through education.

## FREEDOM THROUGH SPEECH

LESTER L. HALE  
*University of Florida*

I certainly concur with Dr. Pullias in his thesis. It may be that from time to time I may repeat an idea. We believe that the message which we have to bring to this convention at this particular session is so important to our own nation and to the freedom of the world that it can bear repeating time and time again.

May I begin with a statement from Arthur Hays in *Let Freedom Ring*? "Indignation boils my blood at the thought of the heritage we are throwing away, at the thought that with few exceptions the fight for freedom is left to the poor, the forlorn, and the defenseless and to the few radicals and revolutionists who have made use of liberty to destroy rather than to maintain American institutions."<sup>1</sup> Our heritage—freedom of speech, press and religion—is a part of our way of life. We point to it with pride. Wars have been fought and won over it and we have reached the point where we forget that such freedoms are not the spoils of war but the tools of peace. Our generation expects its heritage to be fully protected by society and governmental administration while we fail to develop the culture of freedom which we are calling today "self expression." Yet, as Carl Becker has put it, "the preservation of our freedom depends less upon the precise nature of our constitution and laws than it does upon the character of our people."<sup>2</sup> Freedom is not a static condition of state. It is, rather, a dynamic state of mind. Like peace of mind, it comes to those who seek for it in the expressions of his total person, in his services and in his habits of life.

Times change and protective measures become outworn and obsolete in the light of advancing knowledge. I often like to think of a situation that exists at Pensacola, Florida. There stands a high wall around an area that was once the entire city. It was built to protect the inhabitants from the *bad air* that was thought to cause *mal aria*. We know today that bad air does not cause malaria, but the wall still stands as a symbol of progress. We know today that the mere protection by government against aggressive outside forces which seek to deprive us of freedom will not save us from the dry rot of inactive, negative, inexpressive lethargy. "The greatest menace to freedom," says Hays again, "is an enert people; public discussion is a political duty."<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Arthur Garfield Hayes, *Let Freedom Ring* (New York, 1937), 21.

<sup>2</sup>Carl L. Becker, *Freedom and Responsibility in the American Way of Life* (New York, 1945), 70.

<sup>3</sup>Hays, *Let Freedom Ring*, 154.

Freedom for the rank and file of our country—not for just those with the vested privileges of a special class—is our constitutional intent. It is the obligation of teachers of speech to help preserve that freedom by teaching to the masses—to the common man—the conduct of freedom, freedom through speech. If this convention does nothing more for you or for me than to help us to realize the tremendous task and responsibility that is ours, it will have satisfied its purpose and its theme. For indeed, we have a contribution to make to those striving for peace and for freedom which must not be ignored.

But while we recharge ourselves here today with the challenge of the hour, there is reported a growing inarticulateness in our schools. Quoting from Philip Wylie, "Since our school system has failed in its fundamental purpose, the teaching of articulation, it has failed altogether. We have the best communications on earth, but we cannot use them for much. After one hundred and fifty years of free public education, the common denominator for communication among Americans is the soap opera."<sup>4</sup>

There are countless thousands who have been through our school systems who have never gained confidence to speak their minds on important issues. While having this convention program printed, the jobber asked me just what I meant by "Freedom through Speech." I was quite upset. After I told him what it meant, he said, "That is what I thought," and commented that he was sorry that he had never had a speech course that would have given him the courage and confidence to speak out in objection to some pressure that was being placed on all candidates seeking office in our current local elections to have their campaign literature all printed in one of three union shops in a nearby town in another county even though there were no union shops in the local area. He wanted to have the matter discussed, but the other printers in town told him that they did not think that was very wise. "Nothing awakens and improves men so much as free communications of thoughts and feelings. If men abandon the right of free discussion; if, awed by threats, they suppress their convictions; if rulers succeed in silencing every voice but that which approves them; if nothing reaches the people but what would lend support to men in power—then, farewell to liberty," to quote Hayes again.<sup>5</sup> We have learned how to fight *for* freedom, but have not always cultivated the ability to fight *with* it. Yes, I know, there are some semanticists who might, and quite justifiably, challenge the choice of a word or the truth of the phrase that we are submitting to point this subtle difference in definition, but it must certainly be clear that whether we are bound by words or by politics,

---

<sup>4</sup>Philip Wylie, *This Week Magazine*, June 1, 1947.

<sup>5</sup>Hayes, *Let Freedom Ring*, 93.

it is the *self-expression* that must be free and active. Let the challenge fall not only to teachers of speech, but upon all teachers and all individuals everywhere to escape the bondage of a "negative freedom." Eric Fromm has an interesting comment in his *Escape from Freedom*: "We believe that the realization of the self is accomplished not only by the act of thinking but also by the realization of man's total personality, by the active expression of his emotions, and intellectual potentialities. . . . Negative freedom makes the individual into an isolated being, whose relationship to the world is distant and distrustful and whose self is weak and constantly threatened."<sup>6</sup>

We cannot be free, then, in the sense that "the wind bloweth where it listeth," but we must impose positive control. A river has not in its free flow down to the sea the power that develops when a dam impedes and controls its course. Power is gained when obstacles are overcome and controls are exercised. Controlled speech, then, must be exercised to maintain our freedom and to obtain freedom for our brothers here and abroad whose right to equal expression has not yet been established. As James Russell Lowell wrote in his *Stanzas on Freedom*:

Men! whose boast it is that ye  
Come of fathers brave and free,  
If there breathe on earth a slave,  
Are ye truly free and brave?

Is true Freedom but to break  
Fetters for our own dear sake,  
And, with leathern hearts, forget  
That we owe mankind a debt?  
No! true freedom is to share  
All the chains our brothers wear,  
And, with heart and hand, to be  
Earnest to make others free!  
They are slaves who fear to speak  
For the fallen and the weak;  
They are slaves who will not choose  
Hatred, scoffing, and abuse  
Rather than in silence shrink  
From the truth they needs must think;  
They are slaves who dare not be  
In the right with two or three.

How then are we going to control speech so that the culture of freedom is insured? George Prentice once said, "There are many men whose tongues might govern multitudes if they could

<sup>6</sup>Erich Fromm, *Escape from Freedom* (New York, 1941), 258.



but govern their tongues." I always think of my favorite lines from *Cocks Must Crow*. Margaret Kinnan Rawlings comments on the uncontrolled tongues of some women. She says that Quincey could not understand her husband's supposed faithlessness for she had always prepared good meals for him. But then Quincey realized "a woman can't put too much store by hot rations—all the hot rations in the world can't warm up a cold female tongue."

The general sessions of this convention have been designed to develop three natural phases of this subject: first, the setting down of the problem in its relationships with adjacent areas and experiences; second, a concern with the particular opportunities of the interests lying within the field we know as speech; and then, a study of the curriculum that is to satisfy the goals we establish. By way of provoking your thoughts still further towards that end, here are five definite points of view.

First, speech activities must no longer be regarded as extra-curricular in nature or importance. I think we have placed too much emphasis at almost every educational level upon the two groups of exceptional students—those gifted and those handicapped—in speech. While an extra-curricular theatre can and should be maintained to give actor and audience opportunity for greater perfection in performance, an arrangement should exist to give all students, the common student, creative experience just as we arrange for their physical training whether or not they are going to play on the team. Have you seen the recent issue of *The Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary-School Principals* prepared by a committee from our National Association? I recommend it to you. It follows this identical line of reasoning. You get it in the title, "Speech for All American Youth." Parliamentary procedure, group discussions, debate, are not just for those who can win inter-school competition, but should be taught as an integral part of the school curriculum. Now, one must not always think that speech activities must be taught in a speech class; they are sometimes better taught outside the class and in conjunction with other subject matter or as the coordinating core of units of study. Perhaps the solution at the elementary and secondary level is to abandon our traditional effort to get speech courses as such into the curriculum which then become the teacher's main responsibility so that debates and plays have to become "extra" for her as well as for the students. The speech trained teacher might better be employed to supply the geography class, the history and the political science class, or the English class with the expressive aspects of their study. The activity in speech, then, becomes curricular.

Second, just as we have sponsored coordination of effort at the elementary and secondary level, we must seek at the college level to keep unified the many branches of speech. Speech correction



needs the theatre. Theatre needs phonetics. Phonetics needs radio. Radio needs interpretation. Interpretation is a part of public speaking, and so on it goes. When these interests break off to form units of their own or fail to cooperate with each other, which is worse, the segregated programs are not complete, or there develops duplication of effort, wherein practically always the students suffer. The same thing is true of the Speech Associations. Those interested in a single segment of speech fail sometimes to appreciate the good that can accrue when they concern themselves with all of the studies of speech. We must not let the trees obstruct our view of the woods. It is disturbing to me personally to learn of the movement within our own southern region to establish a Theatre Association as a separate organization. The Southern Speech Association has always been ready and willing to develop the theatre interests commensurate with the participation of the theatre people. Just as an otologist or a pediatrician maintains his affiliation through the American Medical Association, we feel it is highly essential for all specialists within the speech field to be active in our general association. We shall be called upon at this convention to express our opinion on this matter.

Third, teachers of speech should regard it as their responsibility to teach spoken English as a foreign language to those who come to us from other countries. In the last few years it has been proven that the oral, phonetic approach to the study of language has produced the most rapid methods of gaining usable control of it. It follows, then, that our own language can be more effectively introduced to a foreign speaking person by those who are trained to present it from a phonetic concept. We must not overlook this opportunity for improving international understanding.

Fourth, if you cannot achieve both, it is more significant to inspire students to produce spontaneous, sincere expression than to require of him elocutionary and exhibitionary oral accuracy. It is not just the exceptional case that is driven from our sphere of influence because we have approached him by asking for careful articulation and voice improvement. One can appeal to the cultural and intellectual potentialities of a person, bringing out the best in him, and thus create in him the desire to speak accurately and with expressive care. But by requiring of him immediate attention to the superficial evidences of refinement, one cannot cause him thereby to be cultured. Let us convince our students of the expressive power that lies within them and then guide the growth of techniques for externalizing only as they can be absorbed without an inhibiting influence.

Fifth, and this follows as the night the day, teachers of speech, then, should be the most cultured, refined, and normal people in the world. If we are to bring out the best in our students, if we are to be influential with the large number of average students, if

we are to win the respect and confidence of administrators and businessmen and the public at large, we must ourselves be sincere, unaffected, wholesome. These qualities are in themselves infectious. This is not accomplished by flaunting accuracy or crude sarcasm, but by kindness, responsiveness, and understanding.

These five items I recommend to your thinking. But most importantly, I appeal for us all to have the vision to see our field in its larger relationships of personal and national developments. Our assets, you know, often become our greatest liabilities. On the beaches of Florida there are many who owe their livelihood to the tourist accommodations they have built by the sea. Yet the ocean with its salt spray and its storms are the greatest destructive force that they needs must face. Money, they say, can be a liability. The Maxwell House, here, has come to the point where it cannot live on tradition alone; tradition has become a liability. Hence, the management has taken elaborate and expensive steps to hold hands with the past while it remodels for the future. You may go down in the little room off of the bar, which I assure you is not completed, and find a nook which is going to be designated as the "Prison Room" because it has in it the original bars which covered the windows when this building was used as a prison for Union prisoners during the War-Between-the-States. We must respect the judgments of our elders who have brought our profession the phenomenal growth it has enjoyed in the past generation. But we must not look just through a telescope for stars while we are blind to the bodies about us who need our attention. How often we have been upset by poor attendance at play tryouts or, perhaps, by enrollment in our interpretation classes of men while fraternity skit and stunt nights uncover many a good actor and a good reader. We must not ignore the great mass of students who come to our door but are afraid to knock. We must not frustrate the free, making of our freedom a liability of negative response, but join with the press and with the church in keeping the vehicles of human expression active and thereby available for all. Do you remember Carl Sandburg's "Is There an Easy Road to Freedom?"

A relentless man loved France  
Long before she came to shame  
And the eating of bitter dust,  
Loving her as mother and torch,  
As bone of his kith and kin  
And he spoke passion, warning:  
"Rest is not a word of free peoples—  
Rest is a monarchial word."

A relentless Russian loved Russia  
Long before she came to bare agony  
And valor amid rivers of blood,

Loving her as mother and torch,  
As bone of his kith and kin:  
He remembered an old Swedish saying:  
"The fireborn are at home in fire."

A Kentucky-born Illinoisan found himself  
By journey through shadows and prayer  
The Chief Magistrate of the American people  
Pleading in words close to low whispers:  
"Fellow citizens . . . we cannot escape history.  
The fiery trial through which we pass  
Will light us down in honor or dishonor  
To the latest generation . . .  
We shall nobly save or meanly lose  
the last best hope of earth."

Four little words came worth studying over:  
"We must disenthral ourselves."  
And what is a thrall? And who are thralls?  
Men tied down or men doped, or men drowsy?  
He hoped to see them shake themselves loose and  
so be disenthralled.  
There are freedom shouters.  
There are freedom whisperers.  
Both may serve.  
Have I, have you, been too silent?  
Is there an easy crime of silence?  
Is there any easy road to freedom?

There is no easy road to freedom—it takes work, worry and long weary hours! There is no true teacher who does not realize that. But our fatigue indicates the need for our service; it shows we are working for something big and worthwhile.

You will recognize these words of Ellis Arnall:

We can have peace with other nations if we discard the advice of the otherwise and the cynical. The world is one world, not because the old relationships between them and distance have been altered by the triumph of man over the air, but because men are the same everywhere. Peace depends upon the relationship between men, not upon the dimensions of the physical world that they inhabit.

We can have freedom, if we make the freedom of other men our concern, because nowhere in all the world can some men be free, until everywhere all men are free. And they will be free on the shore dimly seen . . .<sup>7</sup>

There is the Freedom Through Speech! There is the theme!

---

<sup>7</sup>Ellis Gibbs Arnall, *The Shore Dimly Seen* (New York, 1946), 312.

## FREEDOM THROUGH THE PRESS

EDWARD J. MEEMAN

*Editor, Memphis Press-Scimitar*

The importance of freedom of the press lies in the fact that there can be no freedom in the modern world except through the press. Human freedom is a trinity composed of free speech, free religion and the free press. One of them cannot long exist without the other two. Of these three freedoms, the absence or presence of freedom of the press is most distinctly marked, for there is either a system of government press control in effect or there is not. Therefore the best test by which to ascertain whether a modern country is free or not is to note whether its press is free or not.

Today the area in which the press is free is smaller than it was a month and a half ago because Czechoslovakia has fallen to the Communists. Between the wars Czechoslovakia was one of the finest nations on earth. In perfect freedom the Czechs had worked out their problems by the processes of democracy until they were among the most prosperous and happy people on earth. First, they lost their freedom when they were invaded by the Nazis. With the allied victory in World War II they recovered their freedom, only to lose it again in February, 1948, by a Soviet-directed Communist plot. There is no longer any freedom of the press in Czechoslovakia. If the Communists should seize power in Italy, the freedom of the press, restored after the fall of Mussolini, would pass from that land, and with it all other freedoms.

First things first. Before I discuss how we may have freedom through the press, I must say what we have to do if we are to continue to have any free press in the world through which we can work. We must halt and roll back this tide which is overwhelming the free press and with it all other freedoms, and the decencies which depend on freedom.

How can we do it? The Marshall plan is fine, but it was conceived before the fall of Czechoslovakia, and it is not enough. We must meet a great and immediate danger by great and immediate action.

Why has the free world shrunk? Why is it in danger today of humiliation, defeat, and possible enslavement? Because the free world is poor and weak? Because free peoples are not brave? No, the free world is rich in resources and productive capacity; free peoples are as brave as any on earth.

We are in danger because we are disarmed. We disarmed after World War I and invited World War II. We threw down our guns and hurried home after World War II, and let the Rus-

sians take positions where they now threaten us with World War III.

We must rearm. But re-armament will not be enough. The Free press countries must unite. If we would prevent attack now, or defeat if war should come despite our desire and efforts for peace, we must make our potential strength actual. A temporary military alliance is not enough, for such an alliance will fall apart, and invite some future danger such as the one that threatens us now. Eventually the democracies must form a permanent union; let us do it now. Tomorrow may be too late.

In two world wars we learned that we could not win with a defensive action. After remaining on the defensive for a long time, with great and almost disastrous losses, we went on the offensive and won.

The struggle in which we are now engaged is not merely a military one. In fact we have reasonable hope that by speeding up and perfecting our military establishment, we can avoid war. But whether or not today's struggle eventuates in military action, certain it is that military action will be only one of our weapons, and we could not win by military action alone.

This is a war of ideas. Communism is a false, deceptive and evil idea, but it is not a small idea; it is a large conception. Communism is an idea which has had an appeal for the minds of men—never to the majority in any country, but to enough to give the Communists a fanatical minority, and to vastly influence the thought of the majority.

We can win the battle of ideas only by taking the offensive.

If we are to defeat the idea of Communism, we can do it only with a bigger idea, one which will have a greater appeal to the minds, hearts and emotions of mankind.

There is such an idea—it is the idea of the Great Union. The proposal is that we form the Great Union by uniting the democratic nations. The democratic nations are the countries of Western Europe, the nations of the British Commonwealth, and the United States. These would include Sweden, Norway, Denmark, the Netherlands, Belgium, Luxembourg, Switzerland, France, Britain, Eire, the United States, Canada, Australia, New Zealand and the Union of South Africa, and perhaps also Italy, Greece, and the Philippines.

This would be created as the United States of America was created out of the thirteen colonies. The nations of the Great Union would establish a federal government which would provide a common defense, a common army, navy, and air force, a common foreign policy, a common citizenship making passports unnecessary, a common free trade, a common currency.

This plan was first suggested in the thirties by Clarence Streit in his historic book, *Union Now*. Had it been adopted, it might have averted World War II and certainly it would have made it easier to win and it would have made the victory secure. If it is

adopted today, it would immediately put preponderant power on the side of the free press democracies. As Streit points out, such a Union would hold all the aces. It would have the ace of spades, superiority of productive power, for the free peoples are the most productive. It would have the ace of clubs, superiority of armed power. It would have the ace of diamonds, superiority of resources, for the free peoples control from 60 to 96 per cent of the essential raw materials. It would have the ace of hearts, superiority of moral power, for the free peoples are the heirs of centuries of search for the true, the beautiful, and the good.

The Great Union would create such an area of prosperity that the depression hoped for by the Communists would not come. It would so renew the spirits of free men, and relight the fires of hope and faith that Marxism, gospel of despair, would lose its fanatic appeal.

I have spoken thus because I could not stand before you and talk academically about what we should do to expand freedom through the press, if there were no free press through which to work. I have told you that I think we face a grave emergency of freedom and what we should do about it.

But there remains more to be said. With the independent press preserved and functioning, how do we use it for freedom?

In a democracy, the press is the common meeting ground of all the component elements of society—capital, labor, agriculture, business, the church, schools and colleges, the radio, the theater, civic organizations, political organizations, foundations, and government in all its branches, legislative, executive and judicial; national, state, and local. Here is the forum even of the nations. Here these institutions and groups report each other and are reported. Here each of them goes before society as a whole with their work, their needs, their claims; here society as a whole goes to each of them. Here they are criticized, praised, blamed, and judged—and here each of these institutions criticizes and judges each other. Here they come for the understanding, appreciation and support of others for which every individual and group yearns.

If this is the function of the press, obviously the press must not be controlled by any of the institutions of society. It must be independent of them all, lest it be partial to one and less than fair to the others. It must not be controlled by political parties. It must not be controlled by the church. It must not be controlled by business. It must not be controlled by labor. Most certainly, it must not be controlled by government. The ideal ownership of a newspaper is by an individual or group who has no large economic interest but in newspapers and hence has no client but the public. Possibly a foundation would make a satisfactory newspaper publisher, but such ownership is not likely to have the realism that is possessed by a publisher combining practical professional and busi-

ness aspects, with his feet planted firmly on the ground though his head may very well be close to the stars.

If the role of the newspaper is vital to democracy, is it not also vital that the job be done honestly, fairly, and competently? How can we make sure that it will be so done?

Certainly we cannot look to the government to regulate newspapers, for under such regulations newspapers would soon lose their freedom, and no fault of newspapers under freedom would be as bad as the effects of government gag. The public must guard against any attempts to control the press, direct or indirect. There should be no laws governing the press except the laws of libel, and even these should be carefully scrutinized to make sure they do not go beyond their legitimate purpose of protecting the individual. Newspapers, as business institutions, should be subject to all the general regulations and taxes that apply to other industries and businesses. Publishers and citizens, however, should be quick to oppose any special licenses or taxes which it is proposed to levy particularly on newspapers, for such taxes can be used by politicians or would-be dictators to intimidate, hamper, or put the press out of business, as Huey Long might have succeeded in doing in Louisiana had it not been for the supreme court and the fight put up by the newspapers.

The best assurance that the newspaper will do its job is the sense of responsibility of the publisher and editor. This is growing.

A citizen or a citizens' organization working alone can accomplish much. A newspaper working alone can accomplish much. But citizens and newspapers working together, can accomplish anything.

A much neglected instrument of democracy is the letter to the editor. Great statesmen of international fame do not hesitate to write letters to the *New York Times* and the *London Times*. Often, however, in other cities the citizen will hesitate to write letters to his local papers. There is no good reason for this difference. People often say they don't write to the papers because cranks write to the papers. If leading citizens would write more letters, the expressions of cranks would be less in evidence. But I am not sure that it is in the spirit of democracy to deny a hearing to the crank. Sometimes cranks say things that should be said that more prudent people haven't thought of, or fear to say. The average citizen does not realize the great influence he could wield by writing to the papers. Every survey of reader habit shows that interest in letters to the editor compares favorably with interest in the editorials themselves. Write briefly. If three lines will express all you have to say, do not use more than three lines. But if you have some vital matter to bring before the public, do not hesitate to ask a column of the editor's space. He, of course, will have to be the judge whether it is worth it.



Democracy cannot exist without free newspapers; free newspapers cannot exist without democracy. How can citizens and newspapers join hands to preserve and strengthen this democracy which is essential to both?

To make our democracy work, we must work our democracy. Everything we hold dear, our safety, our liberties, our homes, our prosperity, depends on our democracy. Let us then make it the first interest of our lives. We Americans are great joiners; we have social organizations, charitable organizations, civic organizations, but the one thing which underlies all else, and on which all these activities depend, our democracy, that we have not organized.

So-called "civic" work is not enough. Projects are all right, if we do not neglect the great project, the American way.

Let us have an organization of unselfish, public-spirited citizens and taxpayers which will be the basis of our political system and underlie everything else. Let this extend to every precinct.

Let this organization have charge of the choosing of local government—non-political, merit system government of the city manager type. For there is no use for political parties in city and county government. The charter parties of Kalamazoo, Cincinnati, and other cities have shown that this can be done. They have shown that there is a powerful unselfish enthusiasm among citizens that needs only to be organized to be effective.

Let each precinct of this non-partisan citizens' organization elect delegates to a community committee which would draft public spirited citizens for city and county councils. Let the office seek the man and let the office be the highest token of honor that the community can confer on the citizen.

Let this organization see that our election machinery functions honestly.

There is need for political parties in national affairs; for the present, also, perhaps, in state affairs. But party politics should be undergirded with a non-partisan organization of the processes of democracy so strong, so unselfishly public-spirited and patriotic that our party politics itself will take on this high character.

One of the functions of the press is criticism. It is only right that the press should also be subject to criticism. But both the press and those who criticize it have not known how to keep criticism within bounds of health.

Freedom leads to the inquiring mind. This leads to skepticism and skepticism goes on and on to such extremes that the mind not only questions the truths of religion but the mind doubts its own ability to know. This same extremism enters the social field. Because of the imperfection of human nature, there are many faults in a free society, and people are free to point them out. This goes on and on until it breeds doubt of freedom, and you have Communism. We have already seen what Communism is.



While there are some faults in a free society, there are so many faults in a Communist society that Communist dictators must drop an iron curtain between that society and the free world, so that the slaves of Communism cannot see the beauties of the free world, and so that the sympathizers with Communism in free countries cannot see the horrible results of their theories.

It has been said that the cycle of civilization is in this order: Faith, Freedom, Folly, Fear, Fetters. In our freedom, we have committed the folly of doubting the need and value of freedom, and part of the free world has already been put under fetters. We need a great rebirth of faith in freedom.

When you see a newspaper or magazine you do not like, never let your dislike lead you to call for government control. For under freedom, there is safety in numbers. You do not have to read the paper or magazine you do not like. You can find another that you will like. But under government control, there is only one newspaper or magazine, though it may seem to have many names and forms, for the government, or dictator, is the editor of all the newspapers and magazines. And you had better like the way he edits it, or the concentration camp for you.

Let free citizens and free editors, working together, find freedom through the press, use it, and preserve it. There is yet time, but not much.

## FREEDOM THROUGH RELIGION

W. R. COURTENAY  
*Minister, First Presbyterian Church,  
Nashville, Tennessee*

It was Hegel who once observed that "the history of the world is none other than the progress of the consciousness of Freedom." But what is freedom? What is this condition that men search for and fight for? What is its motivation? What is its objective?

The simplest answer might well be that man desires to be respected amidst his fellows. He does not want to be chattel. He rebels against the social shackles and handcuffs that condemn him to a certain caste or class or place. He can not endure the social forces that seek to compel him to do obeisance before others simply because they are richer, stronger or better placed. He wants to be his own boss, to choose his own place of residence, to select his own job, to spend his own money, to marry whom he pleases, to state his opinions concerning all things, to cast his ballot for those who are to represent him in government, to determine for himself what religion, if any, he is to believe in and follow, to have the privilege of hearing and reading the news without it being strained through government censorship, to have recourse to the courts in defense of his rights, and justice from the courts when brought before them for breaches of law, and above all, free from the police power of the totalitarian state or the misuse of such force in a democratic society.

This is the freedom the majority of Americans enjoy, and even those who do not have all of them, have more of them than any other people in the world. In the main we are the most fetterless nation on earth.

Kipling once wrote,

"All we have of freedom, all we use or know—  
This our fathers bought for us long, long ago."

We are indeed debtors to our forebears. They were the ones who thought and planned and fought and died for liberty. Few of us have done anything to earn the right to the rights we have, and too few of us are seeking to protect them and perpetuate them that generations yet to be may know the unfettered way of life which is so characteristic of America.

There are those who give undue credit to Rousseau, Thomas Paine, Voltaire, and other liberal minds for the right to be free men. They look to France as the mother of democracy. I would not deny the partial truth that is here, but I would affirm and do so with emphasis, that the forces that produced freedom in England and in America do not stem from the iconoclasts of the 18th and 19th

centuries, but from Christian influences that reminded man of his divine relationship and its attendant demands on man. Out of the very womb of Christianity came democracy as we know it.

Someone has said that "everything that the hand of God has touched has on it the fingerprints of freedom." The scriptural story is that God created man and sent him forth into the world to have dominion over it. From the first, man was to be a free moral agent, a creature capable of making decisions, and a creature who instinctively knew that he was accountable for his decisions. However one may interpret the opening chapters of scripture this at least is clear: man was born to freedom *with* God. Faith in God and the prerogatives of freedom were linked in the beginning, wedded by God himself, and to be broken only at the peril of all that men holds dear, and while it is true that religion has often blanketed the mind of man, drugged man with inertia, and barred him from new revelations of truth, we must also observe that Christianity at its best has always inspired the mind of man to new inventiveness, freed him from ideas and habits that prevented his being man at his best, and made him receptive to truth from all levels and areas of human experience.

Democracy as we know it was a religious possession before it was a political possession. Then men who founded this land, and those who have been its greatest leaders, were men of faith. The Pilgrim Fathers, the Congregational, Calvinistic colonists, the Presbyterians, the Quakers, the Baptists, the Methodists and others who walked in the Reformation tradition, knew representative government and good human relationships within their churches, and were the people who put backbone into the wishbones of those who yearned for liberty. No one denies that we draw some of our liberating ideas from ancient Greece and Rome, from some of the German tribes and the Jewish people, but even these would have been lost had it not been for the Christian Church that salvaged them and brought them forward.

Of all the attainments of man, the one I prize highest, and the one that holds the most blessings for future generations, is Christian democracy. Not democracy as Russia conceives it, for with them the use of the word is a misuse of the word, but as the British and the American peoples have conceived it in their best moments. Freedom is an achievement, and only further achievement in its defense can make it a constructive force in the history of our race.

I have never understood Jefferson's remark that "The God who gave us life, gave us liberty at the same time." Is it not nearer truth to say that God gave us life, and gave us also the materials for the attaining of liberty? We are not free just because we are born. Many were and are born into slavery, into countless prisons, some of which are mental, some spiritual and some physical. God wants men to be free. That is why the history of the world is

none other than the progress of the consciousness of Freedom. It is for this very reason that Jesus of Nazareth could say, "If you continue in my teachings . . . you shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." But it was not a "Knowing" once and for all delivered to the Saints. The verb here indicates progressive knowing as if He were saying, "The better you know my words and spirit the more liberty you will possess.

Freedom at its best is the child of the Bible and the Church. It is difficult to conceive of British and American democracy apart from the Christian forces of the sixteenth to the eighteenth centuries. Religion itself was pretty much totalitarian prior to the fifteen hundreds, and the political world had no interest in what we now call democracy. But as the Bible became more and more a part of the thinking of the people, and as people began to realize God's evaluation of man, and common people had more and more of a voice in church and community, the whole atmosphere of the state was changed, and the consciousness of Freedom known in part became an incentive to know it in full. It was in the centuries that followed the Reformation, and carried forward in the spirit of the Renaissance, that representative government, universal education, pure food laws, sanitation, freedom of worship, better labor conditions, hours, and conditions of work, child care, and so forth, became a part of the thinking of millions. When the Bible got down into the thinking and living of people it raised them toward God, and the forces that lifted them toward God also liberated them politically, and gave them freedom. Hence theology, which had formerly been a parlor sport of schoolmen, became the foundation of a new sociology. Theology and sociology became as the two sides of a single coin. One could not touch one without feeling the other. Freedom looked up toward God, and fathered the idea of being man's duty to look out toward all men. Under the Fatherhood of God the brotherhood of man became a necessity.

But it did not come all at once. This freedom we cherish is not a pumpkin that can be raised in a few months. It is a gnarled oak that counts its age in centuries. Little by little Christians learned the deeper meanings of mercy and truth, forgiveness and tolerance, faith and good works. These ceased to be mere religious trimmings and became political teachings. The respectable man resulted from the religious man, and the religious man was the one who championed liberty and representative government. It is not at all strange that it has been said of Plymouth Rock,

"Ay, call it holy ground,  
The soil where first they trod!  
They have left unstained what there they found—  
Freedom to worship God."

Nor is it strange that Faith and Freedom should stand together in our Declaration of Independence, our Constitution, and the American Way. The men who built durability into our American ideals and ideas were in the main men who knew God and strove to live according to the teachings of the Christ.

J. W. Bready is quite right in comparing the results of the French Revolution with the Wesleyan revivals that swept over England and the New World. To the French, "Liberty, equality and fraternity" were no more meaningful or purposive than the platform of a modern political party. The French Revolution is no credit to man! It broke all of the Ten Commandments, and all of the teachings of the Christ. It was the beast's way of achieving justice.

Not so the Wesleyan revival. Wesley faced the most brutal, bestial, profane and depraved period of English social life. Sir Walter Besant has said that the London mobs were "brutal beyond all power of words to describe, or imagination to understand; so bestial that one is induced to think there has never been in any town or in any age, a population which could compare with them." Bready quotes from the *Cambridge Modern History* these words, "The first half of the 18th Century in England was an age of materialism, a period of dim ideals and expiring hopes."

America was in many respects an image of the motherland. Never did man face a more hopeless situation than that which confronted John Wesley, George Whitefield and their followers. Yet they preached and loved the British and American people into a new righteousness, a new experience of God, and consequently into new freedom. Even the Presbyterians became more human and Christian under the beneficent influences of the Great Awakening. England was saved from the hell of revolution, and the revolution in America ended in the construction of a new form of government which guaranteed maximum freedom to all its citizens.

Under the spiritual force released by Wesley and his followers slavery was crushed, education encouraged and expanded, modern nursing service born, homes for neglected children established, better hours of work, better wages, better houses for the poor, the liberation of children and women from the more brutal forms of labor in mines and industry, and a new emphasis on good citizenship. So great was the impact of Wesley's philosophy of life upon the world that we are still coasting on the original momentum.

But the time of coasting is now past. The time of taking freedom of religion for granted is over. We must return to a more dynamic faith. Our safety lies in the improved moral and spiritual character of man. Hence there must be a new emphasis on the place of God in education, government, economics, and pleasure. Unless we can rediscover the fundamentals of Christian faith we shall not be able to maintain our political freedom. The greatest force for

the defeat of Communism at home and abroad ought to be a renewal of our faith in God, a proper repentance for our sins of omission and commission, and a new and sincere dedication to the task of building a more truly moral world. We need all the freedoms we have, and these must be refined and expanded.

Freedom of speech should remind us that it is our responsibility to do some serious thinking. Freedom of the press should move us to make the printed page a challenge to constructive life and not merely a mirror of the imbecility of man. Freedom of religion should not mean freedom from religion, or freedom for irreligion, or the right of a nation to squander foolishly its moral and spiritual heritage. Human rights are in truth the evidence of man's relation to God. Human rights must never be divorced from responsibilities. Nor dare men continually chatter about rights and leave responsibilities unnoticed.

Dr. Charles Erdman once said that "A man is not what he thinks he is, but what he thinks, he is." History has demonstrated that man is strongest and safest in those areas when he is Christ-conscious and society conscious. True freedom cannot live in any other climate. If a man thinks God's thoughts surely he will be a God-man, and to be a God-man is to be a democratic man, and to be democratic is to be free. All the wisdom of the ages is poured into these words, "Thou shalt love God . . . Thou shalt love thy neighbor." Freedom such as we love and desire should come naturally through people who obey these words:

"So long as Faith with Freedom reigns,  
And loyal Hope survives,  
And gracious Charity remains  
To leaven lowly lives;  
While there is one untrodden tract  
For intellect or will,  
And men are free to think and act,  
Life is worth living still."

But life will be worth living in America only as long as we are able to sing with proper humility and sincerity,

"Our father's God, to Thee  
Author of liberty,  
To Thee we sing:  
Long may our land be bright  
With freedom's holy light;  
Protect us by Thy might,  
Great God, our King."

## FREEDOM FROM SPEECH

IRVING J. LEE  
*Northwestern University*

In spite of the pressures in and about Chicago on the necessity of reading the Great Books, I have instead, in recent years, been going back to the speeches in some of this country's Great Debates: Abolition, Evolution, Immigration, Prohibition, and Isolation. I began the reading of these speeches as one interested in the techniques of Persuasion and Social Control to see whether or not the victors used some techniques more tellingly than the losers. That study, though it filled a half-dozen folders with data, is not yet, and perhaps never will be finished, because I am now beginning to wonder whether the acceptance or rejection of a doctrine is ever a function of the rhetorical method only. The success or failure of the persuasion seems related to too many other factors. The study was, however, not without effect. For I came away from that reading with an impression, a reservation, and a fear about the debate phenomenon, as such, that I should like to think about with you.

I have the impression that the well of idealism from which American speakers draw is a very deep one. Whether it is a Brooks or a Grady, a Webster or a Calhoun, a Bryan or a Darrow, a Volstead or a Smith, there are unlimited reservoirs of sincerity. Even in the speeches which make the eagle scream, in the patches of deepest purple there are overtones of honesty. If a man ever loses his hope in the American Dream, let him go to these speeches for refreshment. At least if he reads well, he will know what he has lost, for in them there is neither cynicism nor malevolence. When men took different positions on these great issues, it seemed not so much from hatred of opponents as from affirmation of another idea. And these are not the characteristics of despotisms anywhere.

I was struck in the reading of these speeches again and again with the prevailing atmosphere of sincerity and earnestness. These men meant and believed what they said. I could see in them little of the side-show barker or the tinsel of the carnival.

And it is this very quality of sincerity, this evident seriousness, which is so very, very appealing, that is the source of my reservation. I have come to wonder whether sincerity is enough, for the very fascination of this human quality keeps us from seeing the risks.

The man who speaks with sincerity is presumed to be "free from deceit, dissimulation or duplicity." We take him to be in reality what he appears to be. We assume genuineness. We expect from him neither hypocrisy nor dishonesty. And certainly when

a speaker manifests sincerity, it is easy to see why we will respond to issues as he does. And it is equally easy to be persuaded that sincerity is a sufficient index for our acceptance of a man and what he stands for.

In debate, however, sincerity is most often accompanied by conviction, a rather settled belief in the accuracy and wisdom of what is said. What is said is said with firmness and assurance. Having come to a position, the speaker becomes immersed in it.

There is something dramatic in the presence of a man who speaks in the mood of sincerity and conviction. The pallid prose of labored exposition gives way to a fevered and ardent persuasion. Sedate, plodding sentences give way to cadence and climax. He no longer says it, he asserts it.

It is on this mood that my fear centers. For the line between the assertion of a belief and the feeling of certainty about it is a thin one. When certainty shades off into fanaticism, we are up against what I fear most. Over-intensity leads to extension of the argument. A man protests too much. Whatever differences exist are magnified. The arguments of contending parties push them further and further apart. Defense and attack become so sharply defined that common ground is obliterated. In short, when there is sincerity plus conviction, there is the magnification of the points of difference.

Of course, there are speakers who are not sold on their subjects and who somehow communicate their hesitation. I am not as interested in them as much as I am worried about those who have come to feel an attachment to an issue so deeply that they develop a kind of restricted way of looking which solidifies into arrogance. When a man has become so lost in the visions of his idea, his words may not be the words of God, but they become god-like. The speech is no mode of deliberation, it is the call to crusade. Counter-argument or criticism is not considered a means of testing what is said but rather a reflection on another's dignity and probity. Such a man finds it impossible to distinguish between an argument *ad hominem* and an argument *ad rem*.

Again and again, reading Bryan and Darrow or Wilson and Lodge for example, I have the impression that the very format of the pro and con situation forced each to insist on more than was necessary. Each seemed driven by the necessity of his own certainty to believe more than he had to. Then, having edged to the furthest position possible on the tug-rope, each dug in. What was assurance became intransigence. What had been an argument on a question became a Maginot Line to be defended no matter what.

Now, I have come to wonder whether sincerity or earnestness or a sense of immersion in an idea is a sufficient canon for a speech-making philosophy, for by itself it seems no measure either of a man or a doctrine. For sincerity keep a varied company. I



have no doubt that Adolf Hitler was one of the world's most earnest salesmen of hate. And where can one find more evident expressions of forthrightness than in the confidence-men, the yes-men, the court flatterers, the paid publicists? Indeed, I have been hard put to find a public figure outside of the soap-opera, slick-paper-popular-novels-world who did not reveal qualities of *ethos* in his public arguing. On the basis of this "ethical magnetism" I can find little difference between a democrat and a demagogue, between a William Lowndes Yancey or a Robert Toombs and a Harriet Beecher Stowe or a Wendell Phillips.

When intransigence is the prevailing attitude, how hard it is to get an accommodation of views. The more a man speaks, the harder it is for him to recognize the limits of his position. Even though he sees the world as through a peephole, he is able to speak as though his horizon is unlimited. When this happens, the hope for a "meeting of minds" goes. All too cavalier and contemptuous is his dismissal of anyone who would say or see anything else. Conviction is now handmaiden to recalcitrance. What William James called "the habit of trained and disciplined good temper toward the opposite party" disappears. I recall an experience Josiah Royce had in Scotland:

After presenting what he thought was a rather cogent and profound discussion before a philosophical assemblage, Royce sat back to await questions. None came, until finally a little Scotsman spoke up sharply from the far corner: "I have been thinking over what the learned visitor has said, and I have come to the conclusion that there is nothing in it."

The drama of the performance takes on a tragic note when the issue is joined so sharply that men move from the issue to a concern with each other. Antagonist and Protagonist now are locked in effort against each other. And the problem as such is not dealt with. No longer do the participants look for fresh ways of working on it. The ingenuity which should be focused on new ways of dealing with the situation is diverted to ways of making the other ridiculous. Effort which should be spent on integrative measures is spent on invective. The search for solutions is turned to the organization of adherents. I do not have to remind this audience of what can happen when "unresolvable group antagonisms" seek expression. Debate then gives way to decision by war.

There is a deeper aspect, still, to this drift from the problems to the persons. It involves the glorification of principles to the neglect of experience. When support for any position, whether states' rights or national sovereignty or free enterprise or public ownership, becomes intense and intemperate, the principle has a way of jelling while the streams of life flow on in other directions. Sometimes adherence to well-formulated solutions is maintained

even as the life referred to shifts its course. Just think how the psychiatric findings on alcoholism are making obsolete the arguments both for and against prohibition. Yet with what unquestioning certainties were we assured of salvation or destruction in the 20's unless we found the faith of either Wets or Drys. The beautifully cogent and tightly-knit speeches so bristling with moral warmth and so violently earnest helped to build a wall around the problem which clinical researchers are only now breaking through. In a world so marked with crisis and change as ours, it is all too easy to cling hopefully to any fixed mooring point. But that is a vain security if it would keep us from facing the issues and coping with them. Failure to look to the onrushing tide of events is to be engulfed by them.

I am not, of course, urging any principle which would stress the elimination of principles. I would rather like to face the fact that an exclusive emphasis on the maintenance of a position sometimes leaves one flagging trains on unused tracks. I would have us see the germ of the truth in Gregory Zilboorg's argument that "the common sense of today is the uncommon nonsense of tomorrow."

There is, moreover, a point where the solidification of programs is an invitation to disaster. There are examples in world history where a sharply drawn, clearly diagrammed and outlined plan of either political or social organization became the procrustean bed to which people were driven and on which they were mangled. When a people is governed in the name of external verities and doctrines which may not be questioned, then the individual is degraded and rendered insignificant.<sup>1</sup>

We in this country have been able to keep free from the blinding effects of such dogmas, but I question whether it was because of the contenders in our Great Debates that we have succeeded.

---

<sup>1</sup>From her studies of primitive peoples, Margaret Mead comes to a similar view: "A clear picture of the end—a blue print of the future, of the absolutely desirable way of life—has always been accompanied by the ruthless manipulation of human beings in order to fit them, by the use of rack, torture, concentration camp if necessary, to the desired pattern. When such attempts have been merely the blind intuitive gropings of the fanatical and the power-driven, they have been sufficient to destroy all the values upon which the democratic way of life is based. . . . Only by devoting ourselves to a direction, not a fixed goal, to a process, not a static system, to the development of human beings who will choose and think the choice all important and be strong and healthy and wise in choosing, can we escape this dilemma." Quoted in *Science News Letter*, September 20, 1940, pp. 186, 191.

Supreme Court Justice, William O. Douglas, in his speech at the University of Florida in March, 1948, echoed this notion in these words: "The Creator gave man the same amazing diversity that He gave the mountain meadows in June. Those who try to hold man to one set of aspirations, to one pattern of conduct, or belief, must resort to secret police and armies."

In short, what I am really afraid of is the finalistic mood, the surging insistence that this, my view, is the everlasting and only one, that what was said is all that could be said. It is the "surrender to simplicity" that frightens me.

If the intransigent attitude brings with it an unwelcome cargo, and if we as Teachers of Speech would do something to prevent its growth in our students, with what can it be replaced? I have only a modest proposal. A friend of mine, a botanist, often refers to viable plants, those able to live and grow and develop. I find the notion of viability a congenial one and the image of The Viable Man the one I should like to find in the flesh more often. Indeed, it is this image of viability that I missed in the Great Debates.

The day in March I wrote that paragraph, a crocus bloomed in my garden. One bit of yellow in an acre of mud. It was just big enough, though, to make my point. No library in our time could hold the volumes it would take to describe in full the complexity of that flower. As Cassius J. Keyser said:

There is indeed nothing that admits of *complete* description, for things are so interrelated that however much we may say of a given thing, there ever remains more to say of it; and complete description of one object would involve—in fact would be—complete description of every other.

If this is true of a flower, must it not be as true for any of the great issues?

It is easy to argue this, but how shall we learn it? How can we become so sensitive to it, as an article of wisdom, that it is made manifest even in debate? I can only urge that we try. For its awareness might open the fences built by the vanity of the speaker who so readily comes to believe that he covers more than he does. Indeed, the very neatness of a speech or an essay must belie the tangled involvements it is about. The orderliness of the beginning, middle and end, the trimness of the points in partition, the symmetry of assertion and proof, of statement and support—these are the esthetic strivings of speech-making and we must be ever alert to keep from supposing that the tidings of our talking necessarily describes what Housman called "the general untidiness of the universe." Thoreau's insistence that "the universe is wider than our views of it" is the literary version of a physicist's conclusion that the "new physics has definitely shown that nature has no sharp edges and that there is a slight fuzziness. . . . We are wrong if we try to draw a picture with hard outlines."

In the hurly-burly of argument, when they have not been immunized, the volubility of the contestants leaves little time for recognition of the boundaries superimposed on problems and solutions. It is then too late for a show of viability. Advocates have usually stilled their doubts. John Stuart Mill's comment on this

in his essay "On Liberty" is still relevant: "The fatal tendency of mankind to leave off thinking about a thing when it is no longer doubtful, is the cause of half their errors." Stringfellow Barr put this matter in another context: "The aim of education is to lengthen the gap between juvenility and senility. . . . By assuming that you have now finished studying you can induce incipient senility in a matter of months."

Could we but teach our young people that senility goes with know-it-allness and that viability is a better guide for maturity, we should, I think, have learned one lesson from the Great Debates. And with an abiding consciousness of the limited character of our positions on any subject we might yet create the atmosphere in which we can debate with wisdom rather than bitterness, with an eye to the problem rather than to the persons.

It may seem that I am urging a kind of academic waiting-until-all-the-data-are-in-before-acting philosophy, but I really am not. We must come to decision, but I should like to have the decision based on a larger sense of what is involved, so that the advocates are not paralyzed by their own perspectives. I should like to develop a sharper awareness of the flux and flow of experience so that men do not discuss the realities of the present in terms of doctrines which apply only partially. In 400 B.C. Chuang-Tse put it this way: "With a learned person it is impossible to discuss the problems of life, he is bound by his system." If we could but loosen some of those bonds which tie men to their systems, we might well create the conditions in which men talked with rather than at each other. We might set the stage, in Frederick Lewis Allen's words, "in which unexpected opinions and fresh solutions and ingenious compromises have a hearing."

There were probably few periods in our history when there was greater need for talking about our problems than at this moment. We need the freedom and the urge to speak almost as never before, for in an atomic age the silence that comes after the dropping of the bomb is one that men cannot endure. But we need also freedom from the speech that sterilizes and stills by its very air of omniscience.

An essayist whose name I do not know once said, "The mark of a civilized society is its ability to tolerate or absorb differences of opinion." It would seem to me that Teachers of Speech have a profound and unique opportunity to help young people realize that the capacity for such absorption is as mighty as, and even more useful than, the power of obliteration.

Bertrand Russell put the problem in terms much more pointed than mine: "To teach how to live without certainty, and yet without being paralyzed by hesitation, is perhaps the chief thing that philosophy in our age can still do." It is also something that we might do something about.

## THE CHALLENGES WE FACE

RUPERT L. CORTRIGHT

*Wayne University*

I labor this evening under certain rather serious handicaps. One is that I have been announced as the only speaker, the only detracting feature, if you will, that has any possibility of making you late for *Othello*. Second, the choice of this particular meeting place, The Maxwell House, could have hardly a quieting effect upon a northerner's nerves. I recollect from my history that in this same building some eighty-four years ago many northerners were the beneficiaries of southern hospitality—of southern hospitality in fact so generously persistent that they remained a rather long time looking longingly to the north through iron bars. So I say that I have certain obstacles to overcome, but I wish to say very personally and with all the sincerity that I can muster, that it is a real privilege and a real honor to be here. It is a very fine courtesy extended to the National Association, one that I am sure all of its members appreciate. We need very much more a working together in our field, and I do mean a working together. I think that has some unusual significances for this session in which you have had some sort of Chapel Hill problem. But I remember when Governor Alfalfa Bill Murray of Oklahoma was first elected and it came time for him to take office. On his first day in office he tacked up on his door, where all the office seekers who came rushing on that first day might see it very plainly, "Be brief and to the point, I suspect your motive already." And so I think probably you are saying, "Don't you know the curtain time? You had better get going."

Chief Justice Vinson of the United States Supreme Court said not so very long ago, "This is the age of great challenge," and then added, "which needs to become the age of great achievement." Then in a delightful little editorial in *The Saturday Review of Literature* not so long ago, Amy Loveman said that "the American people today need their imagination inflamed, their determination aroused, and their idealism stirred." It seems to me she has said something of considerable significance. And so, with something of that background, I should like to look with you for a few moments at what I feel are some of the challenges facing our profession.

I speak upon a magnificent backdrop of those speeches which have already made your convention most memorable. Not alone for its size has it been outstanding, but I am sure it must have been outstanding indeed for the inspiration that you are already carrying away with you from the speeches which you have had. Really, there are just three quite simple things that I should like to say to you this evening although I may present them under slightly different

outlines. In the first place, I should like to say to you that we are living in the most influential nation in the world. In the second place, we are in the most influential profession in the most influential nation in the world. And in the third place, I should like to say that in that profession of teaching we are dealing with a subject of tremendous potentialities which certainly has great opportunity of challenging the best of which we are capable.

Look, for instance, at the challenge that comes to us from the community. And when I say the community I mean, today, the world. A little while ago I picked up (I think it was in about mid-January) the Sunday edition of *The New York Times*, and found this announcement with which many of you may be familiar. It was a very large ad, incidentally, at the Sunday rates of *The New York Times*. "Increase your income, conquer fear, develop confidence, speak effectively—Dale Carnegie." Now note: (I did a little figuring) I knew about how many classes there had been (I did not underestimate—I may have missed a few) in my own city of Detroit through the year 1947, and Dale Carnegie had taken out of the City of Detroit not less than \$80,000 in one year because men and women of real professional standing and of enough income to afford that cost were saying, in effect, "Our education we have found wanting." That is the public asking for adult education. I think that is a challenge, and of course I think it is a particular challenge to me personally and to my university for that was in the City of Detroit which we were aiming to serve.

Then look at the challenge that comes from industry. The General Motors organization estimates that 12,000 of its employees are receiving training in speech each year. We have in our institution a very close working relationship developed over the last year and a half or two years with the Ford Motor Company. Some of you may have noted that Mr. John F. Bugas, who left his position with the FBI to become vice-president in charge of Industrial Relations of the Ford Motor Company, said before the American Management Association in New York City last November, "We at Ford believe that this nation's wealth, and that of the world, can be greatly increased by constructive thinking and acting in the field of Industrial Relations." It may interest you to know that the Ford Motor Company is spending at the rate of ten million dollars per year for its Industrial Relations program. And so one could go on with a great many evidences from industry showing the challenge that we are facing.

Look at another area, the challenge to develop leaders for our time. I have covered very close to twenty thousand miles now across this country and have been in more than half of our states in the last ten months. This is the sixth rather large convention which I have attended within the last four months. Everywhere I find expression, in one way or another, of the need of our time

for leaders. When I was in Denver last summer, Dr. Roberts of the Climax Observatory (he serves on the staffs of Harvard and the University of Colorado, is one of the distinguished astronomers and one of the distinguished contributors to the development of the atomic bomb) said, among other things, "Communication, inter-personal relations is the most important business in the world today." He went on to say, "It seems to the scientist that the only defense in the future is the defense of avoiding conflict. The hope of tomorrow is not in the hands of the scientist; it is in the hands of those who work in the area of inter-personal relations." You and I recognize that as a heavy responsibility upon our shoulders and in our field. Woodrow Wilson said long ago, "The remedy for bad politics is the same as that for most diseases, plenty of sunshine and fresh air." We who work in the area of public speaking and discussion feel that there is something of an increasingly heavy burden upon us. Last October at the University of Illinois, the President of Knox College, Linden L. Brown spoke, and said, among other things, "Democracy is the hardest kind of government to operate. But democracy is a government of freedom only when free men work incessantly at it." Those of you who have read with inspiration no doubt, as I have, that magnificent six-volume report of the President's Commission on Higher Education, one of the really monumental documents of our times, noted its statement that if we are going to prove that democracy is the superior ideology and form of government struggling for existence on the earth's surface, we must do it not with words, but with demonstration. And that demonstration will be provided, by and large, by speech-trained people. We have a tremendous stake in influencing the future, and it is important to survey it, both from the close nature of our community, from the area of industrial relations, and upon the international scene.

Communication (and I do not know about that term) is by no means the world's only problem. I would not wish to be accused of blowing up out of all proportion its due place among the problems of the world, but it is at the heart of almost all problems: better industrial relations, better teaching, better democracy, better international relations, happier families, less divorce perhaps, and better adjusted personalities. Communication is at the heart of it. We are working close to that heart. We are making a contribution. Others are expecting much of us. I was at lunch with the Dean of our Liberal Arts College a little while ago. He said, "You will be interested to know the results of a survey our College of Engineering has been making. The College of Engineering decided, as many colleges and universities have been deciding lately, that they wanted to call in a group of the outstanding engineers, men whose names are known by everyone across the nation, and say to them, 'Now, if you had your say about what the College of Engineering's curriculum should be to train the engineer that is coming into the



positions of today, what changes would you make from what we are now doing?" He said, "You will be interested to know that those engineers out on the firing line of life said, 'Put less emphasis on the technical courses and, by all means, give the men more training in expressing themselves in speech and in discussion and in conference leadership.'" The thing that impresses me all the time is that today the demand is for more speech work, more radio, more theatre, more speech correction and speech science activity. You can go all down the line through our whole field. The demand is coming not from us. It is being pressed in upon us by others in all fields who are realizing increasingly the important contribution which that skill has to make to success in almost every field of activity.

And consider the challenge of radio, and television specifically. Some of you may have read the challenge flung to radio by Mahonri Sharp Young in the last July 15 (1947) number of *Vogue*. Or you may have noted in the Spring (1948) issue of *The American Scholar* a rather challenging discussion between Lyman Bryson and Young on radio in America. How little education has done with radio! One very good reason is because in so many places the institutions of higher learning have turned for their radio counsel to places other than their speech departments, to persons other than those who are in possession of the more helpful know-how in regard to the field. The April issue of *The American Magazine* carries David Sarnof's "What Television Means to America." I can tell you just one thing, very hastily, that I think television means to speech, not to *all America*, perhaps, but to us in the field of speech: It means that theatre and radio are going to have to get closer together instead of farther apart, just as it means, I think, that our whole field of speech must draw closer together, for there is no one area of it which possesses resources enough by itself to tackle the challenges which we face.

Do not think that I am neglecting theatre. The challenge to a college community theatre to me has never been greater. Do not think that I am neglecting the science end of the department of speech—speech correction, audiology, etc. You all know the added strain that has been placed upon that area by our increasing awareness of the needs of large numbers of the population for specially and really experienced and trained guidance.

Speech is the servant of all departments and of all fields. It is interesting to note what is happening in the field of philosophy, just as one example. The increasing emphasis of philosophy today is that there is no longer so much a field of philosophy, just philosophy, but there is a philosophy of science, a philosophy of history, of mathematics, of sociology, and so on. Philosophy without its purpose, without its objective, is an almost non-existent thing. Note the startling implications of this for our field. It is thus with



speech wherever it is used, by whatever profession, in whatever activity. It is speech for a purpose, and it is speech serving all departments in all areas.

Personally, I have none of the inferiority complex I find has struck some of my colleagues who feel we must make of speech a science in order to raise ourselves up on that pedestal of admiration where the scientist stands in the academic world. For myself, I would rather stand in the position of one who is willing to serve scientist, academician, and everyone else, in whatever be his area of specialization, in developing finer techniques of expression, finer techniques of the art of discussion and leadership, of getting along with one another, of all that is a part of speech. And I would not overlook, in fact, the development of the thing which we know as culture and enjoyment of leisure time and all of those phases.

Now, in addition to the challenge of the community, the community of the world, there is a challenge which we face from our students. We have never had better ones on the college level. The GI coming back with a greater maturity, with an experience that aged him rapidly, has been the most challenging student that has ever sat in our classrooms. Which has meant what? That he is turning to the instructor up there in front saying, "OK, here is your opportunity. Now produce." We have never faced a higher challenge. We have never faced a more difficult challenge. We have never faced a more searching or more exacting demand upon our best scholastic ability and our best real ability in training.

Then, of course, there is the challenge of our field—the challenge of teaching itself. If you remember your history you will recall that in 1805 Nelson at Trafalgar won one of the great and significant naval battles of all time putting to an end, for the time being at least, Napoleon's threat upon the seas. Then it was just ten years later that Napoleon at Waterloo finally met his defeat upon land. The names of Wellington and Nelson were upon the lips of all the people. They were the heroes of the hour. They were the ones who had changed history. But I would point your attention to some others, to some youngsters who immediately following the time of the Battle of Waterloo, were just making their appearance in the classrooms of teachers. There had been born in that period between Waterloo and Trafalgar Abraham Lincoln, William Ewart Gladstone, Alfred Lord Tennyson, Felix Mendelssohn, Charles Darwin, John Stuart Mill, Robert E. Lee, Henry W. Longfellow, Oliver Wendell Holmes, Pope Leo XIII, just to mention a few. You get my point? The significant personalities of that hour were not the great military leaders. The ones who were going to determine the future were the teachers who would receive into their classrooms those youngsters. So I say that this business of teaching is a challenge, —even more so in times like these.

The other point I would make about the challenge of teaching is embodied in that delightful story which comes down across twenty-five centuries of human history. It is found in an inspiring old book too little read today, but which is alike revered and held sacred by Jew, Catholic and Protestant. In the eighteenth chapter of this old book of Jeremiah, we read how that young man, yet in his early twenties, went down to the potter's house. There he saw how, when a vessel became marred upon the wheel, the potter could begin again with that clay gone wrong and remold it into something useful still. There has never been a more beautiful parable of the challenge of the teacher's job working with individuals who, too often, become clay gone wrong and depend upon some teacher who will remold them into something truly useful and perhaps even great. The challenge of our students, and the challenge of teaching, are great challenges.

There is yet one other challenge that I would mention: The challenge of scholarship. Our students demand it, the community expects it, and the obligation we have to our profession certainly requires it of us. The best of learning that we have ever been able to bring together, the most thorough and the most careful research, the investigation and study of what are the better and more effective means of doing our job are required of us if we are to be worthy of our calling. I think it means that we must put aside pettiness. These are not times for pettiness. These are not times for division among us. In a Conference in Chicago, I sat across the table from a man who was bemoaning the small place given to his area of Speech on convention programs and in *The Quarterly Journal of Speech*. I interrupted him to point out: "Your comments interest me. Here we are concerned about the need for the United Nations and we cannot even demonstrate a united profession." The conversation changed. But I think that is serious and I do not mean to be pointing the finger of blame for I think the blame may be as heavy upon my own Association as it is upon little groups of individuals within it. I think when such conflicts come about we need to approach them with care, and judiciousness, and some statesmanship. If we have made mistakes, let us get together and remedy them. *Let us get together!* For after all, there is enough of challenge facing us that if we are going to do the job that is expected of us today, we had better stick together. That is the only hope we have of really doing it.

There is just one other thing I wish to say very briefly. I often time wonder who will teach speech if the speech teacher does not. As I go about the country where I see so many courses in so many special divisions coming up in our field it seems to me there is such an effort to teach anything and everything but speech. I would like before I leave any speech convention to say just a quiet word again for what I take to be our major responsibility in what-

ever areas of the field we are: the training of, and developing the habit of, effectiveness in speaking.

And I would like to raise just a question about the semanticists. They have a tendency to stress their fear of positiveness. My observation of contemporary life leads me to the conclusion (check me if I am wrong), that those who are exhibiting most positiveness are the quacks (for instance, in the patent medicine ads) and by and large the illiterate and relatively uninformed who do not know enough not to be positive. That poses a serious problem. If we leave to them the only positive voice, where is democracy to look for leadership? If the individuals who know best about their professional fields must speak only in a weak, uncertain voice, whence cometh the leadership? The answer is obvious: from those incompetent to provide it. And so I would like to temper those uncertainties by saying, "After all, who has the greater right to positiveness? To whom have the people greater right to look for positiveness than those who are the specialists in a professional field?"

I believe in the United States of America and its high destiny. I am sure that our way of life is the hope of the world. I believe in my profession of teaching. It is the way by which each generation may be lifted to greater heights than were attained by its predecessors. So far as I know, it is the only way. I believe in the field of speech (discussion, debate, communication, the whole area of speech, theatre and radio) as the instrumentality through which democracy may attain its goal, by which science may not destroy but may better the lot of man, by which that two thousand year old dream of peace on earth, good will towards men everywhere, may become a reality.

## A PROCEEDINGS REPORT OF THE EIGHTEENTH ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE SOUTHERN SPEECH ASSOCIATION

Members of the Southern Speech Association and visitors attending the eighteenth Southern Speech Convention gathered at the famous Maxwell House in Nashville, Tennessee, April 6-10, to participate in a program containing several innovations and to renew professional friendships. Under the direction of George F. Totten of Southwestern College at Memphis, registration began Wednesday, April 7.

A new feature added to the program of the eighteenth convention was the Workshop in Speech Correction and Hearing conducted Wednesday afternoon under the direction of Eugene T. McDonald of Pennsylvania State College, in cooperation with the Tennessee Society for Crippled Children and Disabled Adults and the Nashville Public Schools. The workshop short course was divided into three demonstration clinics meeting simultaneously. State Consultant Elizabeth MacLearie of the Tennessee Speech and Hearing Services directed the articulation clinic before an audience of twenty-five. Using several small children as subjects for the demonstration, Miss MacLearie stated the problem to be considered, that of "tongue-tie," and gave a diagnostic speech test. Mrs. C. J. Restall of the Memphis Shrine School for Crippled Children illustrated relaxation and tongue drills. Ear training was the contribution of Miss Sarah Peters of the Oak Ridge Public Schools. The articulation clinic closed with the teaching of a sound to one of the children present.

The hearing clinic was conducted by George Falconer of Memphis, assisted by Kathleen Presley. Part of the session was devoted to an explanation of the use of audiometry in the speech and hearing clinic. As a diagnostic instrument to determine the type or cause of hearing loss, the audiometer is more valuable than older methods of testing, Mr. Falconer explained. A demonstration of audiometric testing was presented, using a patient with a hearing handicap. The patient's use of a hearing aid to overcome her handicap was also demonstrated. In fitting a hearing aid, Mr. Falconer explained, such factors as sensitivity, tolerance, intelligibility, noise ratio, and psychological effect on the patient should be considered. Miss Presley conducted a test showing the use of lip-reading. There were several lively discussion periods during the program, several members of the audience challenging the statement that a hearing aid will not help the child with high frequency deafness.

In the stuttering clinic, T. Earle Johnson of the University of Alabama discussed the prevalence and causes of stuttering, defining

stuttering as a "disorder characterized by blockings, prolongations, and repetitions of words, syllables, sounds, or mouth postures, all of which produce interruptions and breaks in the rhythmic flow of speech." Having pointed out that there are a number of theories of the cause of stuttering, Dr. Johnson stated that stuttering may arise from three sources: a background of dysphemia, speech hesitations of early speech learning, or neurotic emotional conflicts.

The Workshop was conducted with a combined meeting for general discussion and an open question period under the direction of Dr. McDonald. Questions concerning the possible relationship of stuttering and cerebral palsy and the importance of training in relaxation for stutterers were raised during the review of the stuttering clinic. Miss MacLearie described briefly the organization and support of the Tennessee program of special education, stressing the importance of regional problems and the establishment of regional diagnostic centers. Dr. McDonald closed the joint program with a discussion and demonstration of prosthetic appliances for rehabilitation of cleft palate cases. In his discussion he included kinds of clefts, possible causes, resulting problems, a comparison of surgical restoration and prosthesis, criteria for construction of appliances, speech problems, and training techniques. The large audience found the slides and models especially interesting.

The first general session on Thursday, April 9, had as its central theme "The Fight for Freedom," and as its presiding officer Dr. Batsell B. Baxter. Dr. Athens B. Pullias, President of David Lipscomb College, and first speaker on the program, pointed out in an address on "Freedom through Education" that the average American has long taken his freedoms for granted, not realizing their meaning. The purpose of education is to give knowledge to advance freedom, to attack and dispel ignorance and doubt everywhere, rather than to question the accepted principles of truth, he asserted. The address by Lester L. Hale of the University of Florida on "Freedom through Speech" was one of the highlights of the convention and appears as a paper elsewhere in the *Journal*. Edward J. Meeman, editor of the *Memphis Press-Scimitar*, spoke on "Freedom of the Press." "The importance of the freedom of the press lies in the fact that all freedoms depend on the press," he said. The press is the meeting place of all institutions of our society. The danger to our freedoms lies in our failure to practice them every day. Mr. Meeman called for a renewal of faith by the American people in our freedoms lest they be lost to us. W. R. Courtenay, pastor of the First Presbyterian Church of Nashville, in speaking of "Freedom of Religion," traced the development of modern democracy and the idea of freedom, beginning with the religious men who championed the cause of freedom in social and political life and continuing with the American Revolution. Today we are still coasting on the freedom gained at that time, Dr. Courtenay contended, adding that

"To be a Godly man is to be a democratic man; to be a democratic man is to be free." Irving J. Lee of Northwestern University concluded the first general session with a talk on "Freedom from Speech." He questioned whether sincerity is a proper criterion for accepting a man and reminded his audience that Hitler was earnest. Dr. Lee asserted that the speaker must guard against believing that he says more than he does: we must be aware of things as they are.

A sectional meeting on Speech Correction and Hearing under the chairmanship of Lou Kennedy of Louisiana State University met with about forty members present. Mamie Fishel, Speech Therapist of the Crippled Children's Hospital and School of Campbell's Clinic at Memphis, described the "Speech and Related Needs of the Cerebral Palsied Child" as they are met through aids to health, physical and occupational therapy, and speech therapy. She emphasized the study program of the child and the teaching techniques used. Dr. Claude Kantner of Ohio University, presented an analysis of "Diagnosis and Prognosis in Cleft Palate Speech" in which he described in detail the diagnostic processes of observation of speech habits, oral examination, and case history. The feasibility of speech training and further surgery must be considered in the prognosis. John Duffy, Hearing Consultant of the Wisconsin Bureau for Handicapped Children, and Roger Maas, Director of Dane County (Wisconsin) Speech and Hearing Clinic, enthusiastically discussed "Hearing Conservation and Rehabilitation on the State and County Levels" and an "Experiment in Rural Speech Correction." Mr. Duffy distributed material on the Wisconsin hearing program and stressed the importance of early discovery of children with hearing defects, medical attention, and educational attention following diagnosis. Mr. Maas explained the details of the Dane County organization and program.

The sectional meeting for Radio, with Paul L. Soper of the University of Tennessee as chairman, was well attended. Allen Bales of the University of Alabama discussed the advantages of the campus wired radio station, pointing out that the cost at the University of Alabama was moderate for the large number of students receiving experience in radio or enjoying radio as recreation. The Alabama station has some income through sponsored programs; however, one-third of the time is devoted to public service programs. Harold Weiss of Southern Methodist University read a paper on "Cooperating with the Local Radio Station," in which he discussed the problems of different viewpoints and competition for talent and advised that a university station be established if feasible. Mr. Duncan Whiteside of the University of Mississippi discussed the problem of "Setting Up a Fundamental Radio Course," its object being to deglamorize radio and show its difficulties to the students. The course should develop an appreciation of radio as a medium, a knowledge of technical and mechanical details, and self-discipline

for the student. Mr. Whiteside's final advice was "to work the life out of them." David Phillips of the University of Tennessee discussed the equipment necessary to set up a system for school radio programs. Such a system, he concluded, would give the student an opportunity to learn some of the problems of radio as well as to gain an appreciation of radio and to develop greater skill in articulation.

The Phonetics section met with Edna West of Georgia State College for Women as chairman. The first speaker was David Phillips, who presented findings from his study of "Language in Conversation" at Stephens College. C. M. Wise of Louisiana State University followed with a survey of "Dialect Areas in America," the general boundaries of which he pointed out. Emphasizing the need for attention to dialects, Dr. Wise warned that substandard speech can be corrected only when the standard for the area is known. "Standardization Influences of American Radio" was the subject of a discussion by Harold Weiss, who used recordings of radio announcers as a basis for pointing out trends and controversial points in contemporary radio announcing. Howard Townsend closed the meeting with a report of "Teaching Practices Applied to Language," in which he emphasized the value of phonetics as a tool for the teaching of speech.

Althea Hunt of the College of William and Mary presided at the sectional meeting devoted to the theatre. D. B. Dusenbury of the University of Florida opened the program with a paper on "The Forgotten Play." Dr. Dusenbury believed that current Broadway successes are acceptable in college, but he advised that the college theatre consider other types of plays: the regional, the socially critical, the historical, the revival, and the experimental. The second paper, "Stage Construction and Equipment," was given by McDonald Held of Louisiana College, who discussed the proper construction, mechanical equipment, and lighting of the stage and recommended that the services of a recognized theatre consultant be secured before a stage is constructed or equipment purchased. In her paper, "What Price Negro Drama?" Lillian Voorhees of Fisk University stated that Negro drama must be considered from three standpoints: It must be for the Negro, by the Negro and of the Negro, until a more universal outlook will help us to see that "there is no race in art." Marian Winters of the American National Theatre Academy discussed "ANTA and the Theatre of the Future." Miss Winters explained that ANTA, a non-profit, non-commercial organization, was chartered by Congress and is working for the stimulation of interest in the theatre, its specific service being to bring the finest technical experts in the theatre to the colleges and universities. Spirited questioning from the floor followed Miss Winters' discussion.



At a meeting of those interested in the History of Public Address, Bower Aly of the University of Missouri, Karl R. Wallace of the University of Illinois, and Dallas Dickey of the University of Florida discussed projects now being studied and developed in this field of research.

A widely known authority on makeup gave a demonstration at the late Thursday afternoon session. Richard Corson, Associate Director of Makeup Arts Institute of New York and author of *Stage Makeup*, demonstrated the techniques involved in applying makeup for the character of Cyrano. He advocated the use of greaseless cake makeup as being easier and quicker to apply than are other types. A highly interesting part of the demonstration was Mr. Corson's use of rubber pieces for nose, eyebrows, and hands.

Almost all the members of the association and the guests attending the convention were present Thursday evening at the Impromptu Merry-Go-Round, a dinner given at the Rawlings Dinner Club. Lester L. Hale, president of the association, was master of ceremonies. Among the impromptu events offered at the conclusion of the dinner were the singing of rounds, a cornet solo, daffy definitions, duets, and a faculty burlesque by the members of the staff of the University of Florida.

"Freedom through Speech" was the theme of the first general session on Friday, April 9, at which Charles A. McGlon of the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary presided. Joseph C. Wetherby of Duke University viewed freedom "In the Realm of Radio," basing his discussion on five needs of educational radio: the discovery of program material for audience-appeal, experimental development of programs, building of critical listening habits, creation of an informed public opinion, and the development of a system of ethics for radio. In a stimulating discussion of "Social Responsibility in Speech Education and Re-Education," Claude E. Kantner of Ohio University reviewed the development of speech through phases that emphasized its use first as an art, then as a utilitarian skill. Dr. Kantner saw the growing stress on moral obligation as a sign of the current trend, leading us in the direction of the development of social responsibility. Sara Lowrey of Baylor University examined freedom "Through Theatre and Interpretation" and found that their contribution is that of "harnessing emotion to reason," presenting truth, and developing the techniques of free speech. The last speaker of the session, Elton Abernathy of Southwest Texas State College, pointed out that "In the Land of the Dumb" a failure of communication means the breakdown of democracy.

The second general session on Friday morning was concerned with a panel discussion on "The Speech Curriculum," H. P. Constans of the University of Florida presiding. Charles T. Webb of the University of Tennessee discussed the subject from the viewpoint of the secondary school. Describing the majority of the present

programs in the secondary school as being unsound and impractical, he recommended that at least one good course be offered in the high schools, along with more courses for those who can take them. "The Speech Curriculum in the Teacher Training Program" was discussed by Felix Robb of Peabody College. He stressed the fact that teachers colleges should provide a course that will increase the teacher's proficiency in speech and maintained that the larger college should also offer a good sequential course in speech. T. Earle Johnson of the University of Alabama suggested that the speech curriculum in the college should provide a course that will train three groups of students: the student with superior speech ability, the average student, and the student with defective speech. In discussing the curriculum in the graduate school, Bower Aly of the University of Missouri held that there is a curriculum in speech at the graduate level but that other factors are more important than courses to be taken. Training programs for the Ph.D. should be tailor-made, Dr. Aly stated, expressing the belief that the teachers must build unity in the speech program, if there is to be unity. A lively discussion from the floor followed, the point being stressed that speech work must be strengthened at all levels. Dr. Johnson recommended that study groups be organized in the South with the idea of publishing findings and sending the reports to state departments of education.

The Methods and Materials session Friday afternoon was devoted to a discussion of problems at the secondary and elementary levels. Carolyn Binkley of East High School in Nashville recommended a course of study that would give the high school student two years of academic credit. Miss Binkley felt that the fundamentals course should place emphasis on the improvement of everyday speech. Christine Drake of Florida State University presented copies of a classified bibliography containing the more recent publications of materials and methods for use at the elementary level. She explained that the types of speech activities listed were in the order in which they might be used in developing a program of speech training at the elementary level. The final discussion, "Let's Collaborate," was given by Rebekah Cohen of Central High School, Memphis. Stating that colleges often withhold credit for speech work done in high school, she expressed the hope that the high school course in speech would receive recognition. The chairman, Ruby Krider of Grove High School, Paris, Tennessee, led a discussion at the conclusion of each paper.

The sectional meeting on Southern Graduate Research, over which Dr. Dallas C. Dickey presided, was well attended, and five interesting papers by Southern graduates were read. Howard Townsend of the University of Texas gave a discussion of the "Survey as a Type of Research." He was quick to state that survey returns will be based on the construction of the survey blank, the framing of

the questionnaire being perhaps the most important step in survey research. Amy Allen of Texas State College for Women gave a paper on "The Role of the Rh Factor in the Etiology of Spastics, Stuttering, Aphasia, and Delayed Speech," her project being to determine the significance of the factor in causes of speech disorders. She reported that when the father and mother had opposing blood compositions, the chance for appearance of a defect in the children was greater. Jack Mills of the University of Florida read a paper on the "Speaking of William Jennings Bryan in Florida," for which he found a wide selection of materials related to religious, occasional, and political oratory. Mr. Bryan taught an open air Sunday School class, made speeches in favor of prohibition, ran for Democratic delegate to the national convention, and was instrumental in securing the passage of a law prohibiting the teaching of "Atheism, Agnosticism, and Darwinism" in the public schools of Florida. The problems, procedures, and tentative findings of a study in progress "In Quest of the Laws of Stress in the Pronunciation of English" were summarized by Francine Merritt of Louisiana State University. In an examination of the pronunciation of all English words containing affixes, Miss Merritt stated, evidence at the present stage of development of the problem indicates that English pronunciation is more systematic than it is generally believed to be and that the study will have predictive values. Mr. Andrew Erskine of the University of Alabama spoke on the "Development of the Liturgical Drama."

As a program for the Interpretation section, Mary Latimer of Madison College gave a performance of James M. Barrie's "Half an Hour," varying her method of presentation from impersonative in the first scene to interpretative in the second and third scenes. Miss Latimer expressed the opinion that the significant difference between the two types lies in presenting one from memory and the other from the book, and she pointed out advantages and disadvantages of each type. After the play had been read, the audience discussed the performance, many of them agreeing that impersonation could be an important training technique but that they preferred interpretation for performance.

H. Hardy Perritt of the University of Virginia presided at the Public Address section meeting on Friday afternoon. Karl R. Wallace of the University of Illinois spoke on "Research in Public Address and the Teaching of Public Speaking," his point of view being that the teacher of speech can gain from research techniques and examples for use in the classroom. Batsell B. Baxter of David Lipscomb College summarized "The Heart of the Yale Lectures," pointing out important principles of preaching presented in Yale lectures through the years. In "The Preaching of Alexander Campbell," Carroll Ellis of Louisiana State University analyzed Campbell's philosophy of speech and revealed Campbell's application of his theories to his preaching. The final report, by Lois Jean Fitz-

simmons of Murphy High School of Mobile, dealt with the "Secession Oratory of Hilliard and Yancey" with particular emphasis on the career of Hilliard, who opposed Yancey in the secession debate.

A demonstration group discussion on the question, "How Can Forensic Programs Be Improved?" attracted a responsive audience Friday afternoon. Chairman H. Hardy Perritt explained that the demonstration served a two-fold purpose: to show a type of panel discussion in which there is no formal speaking and to stimulate thinking on the improvement of the forensics program. Wayne Eubank of the University of Florida, Charles L. Sullivan, student of the University of Mississippi, Freda Kenner of Messick High School in Memphis, and Meredith P. Crawford of Vanderbilt were participants. Among the problems brought forth in the discussion were the lack of audience-participation in debate, limited budgets, possible over-emphasis on winning decisions, and use of new and experimental types of debates. After a brief summary, the chairman led a spirited discussion by the audience.

The convention banquet was held Friday evening in the Colonial Ballroom of the Maxwell House, President Lester L. Hale presiding. Visitors attending the convention from other areas were presented by Dr. C. M. Wise. Rupert L. Cortright, President of the Speech Association of America, presented the banquet address, a stimulating examination of "Challenges We Face." Professor Cortright demanded that educators generally, and speech teachers in particular, assume the leadership of a faltering world. Our destiny is in the hands of the mediocre people, he said, because the better educated men find themselves unable to make decisions or take a forthright stand on issues. The speaker's remarks were given thoughtful and appreciative attention by the large audience attending the last official function of the convention.

In connection with the eighteenth convention, the annual Southern Speech Association Tournament and the Student Congress of Human Relations were held in Nashville, April 6-9, the tournament being directed by Dr. Wayne C. Eubank and the congress by Mrs. Bertha S. Hunt, assisted by Miss Midge Wood. Participants included fifty-seven forensic directors and 310 students entered in interpretation, extempore speech, oratory, after-dinner speaking, debate, and the student congress. The tournament was concluded Wednesday, April 7, with a banquet and the presentation of awards, Dr. Eubank presiding. Following the finals of the after-dinner speaking contest, P. E. Lull of Purdue University emphasized the importance of debate and criticized unethical debate procedures in an address that was a high point of the tournament.

Members of the association and guests availed themselves of the opportunity to visit two university theatres. The Fisk University Stagecrafters presented "The Purple Lily" by John Ross for the Association on Wednesday evening, April 7. Friday evening, the

members of the association were the guests of the Department of Drama of Vanderbilt University for a performance of *Othello*.

Two other valuable contributions arranged by the program committee should not be overlooked. For the benefit of graduate students present at the convention, graduate conferences with representatives of major departments in and out of the Southern Association area were scheduled to allow graduates to discuss their problems. In addition, shop talks by various advertising groups were scheduled in order to encourage examination of their products and to draw interested groups together. Both of these projects were helpful to those attending the convention.

Both the standard programs and the innovations of the eighteenth annual convention of the Southern Speech Association drew appreciative audiences and words of praise for those who planned the program and those who participated in it. Much of the success of the convention was owing to President Lester L. Hale and the program committee assisting him: Lou Kennedy, Paul Soper, Harold Weiss, Althea Hunt, Dallas C. Dickey, H. P. Constans, Ruby Krider, Mary Latimer, Hardy Perritt, Billie Vliet Keefe, Elizabeth MacLearie, Eugene T. McDonald, Charles McGlon, and T. Earle Johnson.

Reported by the Proceedings Committee

Francine Merritt, Chairman  
Louisiana State University

Christine Drake  
Florida State University

J. T. Daniel  
University of Alabama

## MINUTES OF THE EIGHTEENTH ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE SOUTHERN SPEECH ASSOCIATION

The Eighteenth Annual Convention of the Southern Speech Association was held in Nashville, Tennessee, April 7-9, 1948. One hundred and eighty-eight persons were officially registered, this being the largest attendance in the Association's history. The program, arranged by Dr. Lester L. Hale of the University of Florida and his Associates, was well received and well attended. The business meetings were all well attended.

The Executive Council met April 7, 1948. Mr. Capel moved that the minutes of each meeting be read and approved at the succeeding meeting of the Executive Council and the complete minutes be published in the September issue of *The Southern Speech Journal*. Motion carried.

C. L. Shaver moved that the problem of the Business Manager of the *Journal* be referred to the Constitutional Committee with the recommendation that the office of Business Manager be eliminated as an elective office and that an Advertising Manager for *The Southern Speech Journal* be appointed by the Executive Secretary and the Editor of the *Journal*. Motion carried.

The financial report for the year 1947-48 was read and referred to the Audit Committee.

Executive Secretary, George Totten, submitted his resignation as of April 9, 1948. Resignation accepted.

Mr. Constans reported the offer of a grant from the University of Florida to subsidize in part the publication of *The Southern Speech Journal*.

Mr. Capel moved that the Executive Council present to a business meeting of the Association the offer of the grant with the recommendation that the Association accept the grant with the understanding that the first year the grant be used in expanding the *Journal* as far as is practicable. Motion carried.

In a General Business Meeting of the Association the following business was taken up.

C. M. Wise reported for the committee on Constitution. Suggested revisions were adopted. (The revised Constitution appears elsewhere in this issue of *The Southern Speech Journal*).

T. Earle Johnson reporting for the Committee on Nominations, submitted the following names:

President:	Charles McGlon, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Kentucky
1st Vice-President:	Glenn Capp, Baylor University, Waco, Texas
2nd Vice-President:	Betty May Collins, Memphis Tech, Memphis, Tennessee

- 3rd Vice-President: Wayne C. Eubank, University of Florida,  
Gainesville, Florida  
Editor of the Journal: Dallas C. Dickey, University of Florida,  
Gainesville, Florida  
Executive Secretary: J. T. Daniel, University of Alabama, University,  
Alabama.

The Association elected this group of officers unanimously.  
The following were elected to the nominating committee for 1948-49:

- Sara Lowrey, Baylor University, Waco Texas  
C. M. Wise, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, Louisiana  
T. Earle Johnson, University of Alabama, University, Alabama  
Batsell B. Baxter, David Lipscomb College, Nashville, Tennessee  
Lester L. Hale, University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida.

In a general business meeting April 9, 1948, the following was taken up:

Miss Evelyn Haven-Gould presented the Resolutions Committee report. The resolutions were passed.

Miss Sara Lowrey reported for the committee on time and place. This committee recommended that the first full week in April be set aside as the convention date. Waco, Texas, was recommended as the 1949 convention city. This report was accepted.

Mr. Capel reported the recommendation of the Executive Council that the Association should meet in a relatively central area every alternate year and on the periphery of the area the other year.

Mr. Gray reported for the Audit Committee. It was the recommendation of this committee that the Executive Secretary be authorized to spend a sum not in excess of \$50.00 to establish a system of sound accounting procedures for the Association. Report accepted.

It was moved that authority be given the president to fill any vacancies that may occur in offices with the approval of the advisory council when there is no established procedure for filling such vacancies. Motion carried.

The Association voted to accept, on the recommendation of the Executive Council, a grant of \$500.00 from the University of Florida to be used in expanding *The Southern Speech Journal*.

In a final meeting of the Executive Council July 10, 1948, reports of the officers for 1947-48 were presented.

1st Vice-President Charles McGlon reported on the activities of this office in securing new members.

2nd Vice-President Bertha S. Hunt reported on activities in promoting speech in the high school and elementary school level.

3rd Vice-President Wayne C. Eubank reported on the Speech Tournament.

The Advisory Council was designated to act as a budget Committee to study the financial position of the Association and prepare



a tentative budget to be presented to the 1949 Association Convention.

C. L. Shaver was elected to the Advisory Committee replacing C. M. Wise whose term expired.

President McGlon appointed a committee of Wayne Eubank, H. Hardy Perritt, and Robert Capel to study the problem of awards for the Southern Speech Association Tournament, and to make recommendations in 1949.

The Association's financial condition is the best it has been in some time. The financial statement of our present position as of August 1, 1948, appears elsewhere in this issue of *The Southern Speech Journal*.

Our present active membership totals 258. Of this group, 56 are sustaining members. Many University and College Libraries throughout the United States subscribe to the *Journal*. Our present active membership can be increased. It is up to the members of the Association to assist your officers in getting new members by telling people in your departments not now members about the Association, its aims, its purposes and its publications.

Submitted by J. T. Daniel,  
Executive Secretary

SOUTHERN SPEECH ASSOCIATION  
Statement of Finances  
As of August 1, 1948

## ASSETS:

Bond, First Federal Loan and Savings Association, Tuscaloosa, Alabama .....	\$ 100.00	
Cash, City National Bank, Tuscaloosa, Alabama* ....	1,553.26	
		<hr/>
		\$1,653.26

\* Summary of Cash Receipts and Disbursements  
For the Period April 6, 1948, through July 30, 1948

## RECEIPTS:

Regular and Sustaining Memberships .....	441.50	
Interest on Bond .....	2.50	
Exhibitors' Fees at Convention .....	190.00	
Tournament Fees .....	462.25	
Advertising in March Journal .....	173.75	
George Totten, Close Account at Memphis, Tenn. ....	372.00	
Grant for Journal, University of Florida .....	500.00	
		<hr/>
Total Receipts .....		\$2,142.00

## DISBURSEMENTS:

Printing March Issue of Journal .....	245.17	
Secretarial Expense, President .....	93.80	
Convention:		
Banquet .....	33.34	
Flowers .....	4.08	
Badges .....	24.00	
Packing Exhibits .....	4.50	
		<hr/>
		65.92
Postage, Express, Printing, Office Supplies .....	132.85	
Refund, Overpayment of dues .....	1.00	
Audit, Setting up accounting system for Association (Voted at Nashville Convention) .....	50.00	
		<hr/>
Total Disbursements .....	588.74	588.74

## BOOK REVIEWS

*SPEECH CRITICISM: The Development of Standards for Rhetorical Appraisal.*

By Lester Thonssen and A. Craig Baird. New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1948; pp. xvi & 542; \$5.00.

This "preliminary treatise" in rhetorical criticism is at least four projects in one: it is a rationale for the rhetorical critic; it is a history of rhetorical theory; it is a history of speech criticism; it is a reapplication of classical standards of criticism to modern conditions. The book is divided into six parts and two appendixes. All these divisions possess brevity, thoroughness, competence, and an attractive unity.

Part I, "The Nature of Rhetorical Criticism," discusses, in one chapter, "formulating the criteria by which the speech is judged." Some of the topics treated are: "Relation of Criticism to Theory and Practice, Definition of Rhetorical Criticism, Types of Rhetorical Criticism, Qualifications of the Rhetorical Critics, The Functions of Rhetorical Criticism."

Part II, "The Development of Rhetorical Theory," is a severely condensed and elemental history of rhetorical theory from Homer to Winans. It devotes a chapter each to the Greek rhetoricians, elaboration of Aristotelean principles by the Romans, and modern theorists.

Part III, "The Methods of the Critics," is a history of criticism which parallels Part II in organization, except that the Greeks and Romans are treated in one chapter as "The Critics of Antiquity," the critics between 1600 and 1850 in another, and those from Goodrich to Brigance, Reid, Gilman, Aly, and Dickey in a third.

With this background of slightly over half the book, Part IV, "Preliminary Aspects of Rhetorical Criticism," comes to "the peculiar and difficult problems of research faced by the speech critic." These are dealt with in three chapters devoted to areas of investigation, authenticity of texts, and social settings.

The climax of the book comes in Part V, "Standards of Judgment," in which the authors define and illustrate their standards of judgment. Chapters are devoted to logical proof, pathetic proof, ethical proof, speech organization, style, delivery, and measures of effectiveness.

The final Part, "Postscript to an Inquiry," consisting of the eighteenth chapter, is a seven page discussion of a philosophy of rhetoric. It closes with the following reaffirmation of faith:

The spoken word is eternal. It is a treasured legacy of the ages. Some few men there will always be, when the future of the state is in doubt, who will come forward to express the aspirations of the people in dignified, honest speech. Such words may yet help man to realize the genuinely good life.

Appendix A consists of twenty-six pages of readings and exercises, and Appendix B contains twenty-one pages of citations, both arranged according to chapters of the book.

In spite of the all-inclusive nature of *Speech Criticism*, one significant shortcoming is apparent. Herbert A. Wichelns wrote in his 1925 essay, "The

Literary Criticism of Oratory," published in *Studies in Rhetoric and Public Address in Honor of James Albert Winans*:

If now we turn to rhetorical criticism . . . , we find that its point of view is patently single. It is not concerned with permanence, nor yet with beauty. It is concerned with effect. It regards a speech as a communication to a specific audience, and holds its business to be the analysis and appreciation of the orator's method of imparting his ideas to his hearers.

Brigrance makes essentially the same statement in the preface to *A History and Criticism of American Public Address*; so do Thonssen and Baird in Chapter 17 of *Speech Criticism*. If this is true, it seems that effectiveness as a standard of speech criticism deserves more attention than a fourteen-page chapter and occasional mention throughout the text. Have we made such poor progress in the real purpose of our art that there is so little to say about it? Perhaps, however, the greatest strength and the severest weakness of the book combine in its almost strict Aristotelean treatment of criticism.

Doubtless the somewhat unorthodox arrangement of putting notes, exercises, and readings in the appendixes contributes to the exceptional attractiveness of format. However, the question must be raised: Are not these features, excellently done and possessing such singular utility, well hidden from most students and far too many instructors?

The many uses of this volume are well summarized by the authors when they say in the Preface:

Believing that this time-honored discipline of criticism should be as closely and definitely related to speechcraft as it has been to literature, history, and art, we offer this volume. There exists a well-developed body of theory for public speaking; here we seek to articulate critical standards *with* the theory. Although designed as a text for a college course in speech criticism, we believe that this book should prove of comparable value in courses dealing with rhetorical theory, advanced speech composition, and the history or philosophy of public address. The extensive scope, the analytical consideration of authorities in speechcraft from the ancients down to our own time, and the wide use of citation that characterize this book should also establish its value as correlative reading in more general introductory courses. It should prove its worth in libraries, whether general or educational, and especially in the personal libraries of speech instructors and speech majors, both undergraduate and postgraduate.

The book obviously is not intended to be all purpose in its multifold nature; it is entirely too skeletal to suffice as even the major source of reading matter for any of the courses mentioned, except a course in criticism. Nevertheless, its completeness of scope, its wealth of quotations, especially in Parts II and III, its richness of citation, its utility in exercises and readings, all make it invaluable as a text or reference for courses in the history of classical and modern rhetoric as well as the ones mentioned by the authors.

Quoting *The CHAPA Letter* (published now and then by the Committee on the History of American Public Address), Vol. I, No. 1, March 22, 1948,

"Everybody who is anybody (as they say in our part of the country) will have to read this book."

University of Virginia

H. HARDY PERRITT

AN INTRODUCTION TO THE PHONETICS OF AMERICAN ENGLISH. By Charles Kenneth Thomas. New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1947; pp. ix & 181; \$3.00.

Those of us who have to introduce perennially willing but spelling-bound students to the mysteries of English phonetics, have been waiting for a long time for a sound, readable, and simple text book. Passy and Klinghardt are in foreign languages, Sweet and Jones concern themselves with British English, Kenyon's *American Pronunciation* is an excellent book, but not designed as a text in phonetics. Therefore a scholar who has established himself as solidly in American dialectology and phonetics as has C. K. Thomas of Cornell, is given an attentive hearing when he brings out a book on speech. It is doubly unfortunate that *An Introduction to the Phonetics of American Speech* is not the book we have been waiting for—a thoroughly useful book is badly needed, and Professor Thomas is one from whom it might have been expected.

There is much of value in the book, and when the author is speaking from knowledge gained from his extensive dialect collections, he speaks with authority even when his findings are not in accord with those of the *Linguistic Atlas*. Further, the examples are often fresh and revealing, as in the contrast between "we'll earn" and "we learn." In spite of such virtues, however, the book is marred by a number of confusions. One of the most pervasive of these is the phoneme and phonemics. Both in the preface and chapter one the author announces his intention of treating English in terms of phonemes, yet the description which follows is confusing. Among the entities given separate treatment is "long u." Most phonemecists would regard this as a cluster, rather than an entity. Further, it is stated that the variation between *new* with a consonantal glide before the "u," and the vowel of "it" before the "u," is never phonemic. It seems that here the author is departing rather widely from current linguistic usage. Phonemic descriptions may, it is true, be non-unique, but it is generally agreed that contrasts like "yip" and "it" though non-minimal, still establish that the consonant and vowel in question are different phonemes. Thus the variation in pronunciation of such words as *new* must always be phonemic, even though it is not significant. One wonders how Professor Thomas would treat the variant pronunciations of *either* and *neither*. Would he describe these also as non-phonemic?

When the confusion in phonemics is added to the confusion resulting from trying to write an analytical and prescriptive book at the same time, the result is even more unfortunate. Thus on page forty:

[t] is a highly variable sound, some variations are normal; others, substandard. The principal native difficulty is a tendency to weaken the sound, especially in the middle of a word. [t] may then change to a kind of [d], to a variety of [r] made with a single tap of the tongue against the gum ridge, or to a laryngeal click known as the glottal stop. Or it may vanish completely. The careless pronunciation of such words as *little, better, facts, mountain, and bottle* illustrate these weakened forms.

There is trouble at the outset of this passage over the statement "a kind of [d]." If by this statement the author means the voiced medial flapped [t] so widely used in American English, it is not a "kind of [d]," since it is still phonemically distinct. Further, as long as the phonemic distinction remains, there will be no confusion of words except in the speech of those who do not know the language thoroughly. Also, since this variety of *t* is very widely used, it seems difficult to condemn it by any standard dependent upon usage. Again with the glottal stop: is it captious to object that it is not a click in usual phonetic terminology? There is also a considerable difference in social prestige in the use of a glottal stop in *mountain* and in *bottle*, yet we are not told whether either of these forms is to be regarded as normal. Finally, to call all of these allophones of [t] (or possibly allophones of other phonemes) equally weakenings brands them at the start as reprehensible. Yet such pronunciations seem to me as normal and inevitable as the loss of aspiration in *stool* (if loss is the proper term to apply to its absence). This loss is just as much a departure from the ideal phonemic norm as those condemned as careless. I am afraid, therefore, that a conscientious student would carry away from the reading of this paragraph only a reinforcement of his already fixed idea that he should always pronounce as he spells, even when the word happens to be *phthisis* or *Wednesday*.

For these and other reasons the book is a disappointment. We will have to go on for a while using our mimeographed sheets, our extemporaneous translations of Passy or Klinghardt, and our halting vulgarizations of Bloomfield or Pike. It is to be hoped, however, that Professor Thomas will rework his book so as to make it more nearly the tool for which we are waiting.

University of Virginia

ARCHIBALD A. HILL

RADIO NEWS WRITING. By William F. Brooks, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1948, pp. v & 197. \$2.75.

Thousands of news editors in stations over this country probably will read this book, say "how interesting," shove it into the drawer of a desk, and go back to their weary, daily stint. The book has little to recommend it to the day by day news editor who has not the power, nor the money of a network organization at his back. If there is any place this book really errs it is on the level of its approach. There is too much network.

As a survey of radio news broadcasting history, as a book of examples of network news programs, as a guide book of what to write and what not to write for the network in the way of news copy, this is a fine outline. Even in this the author rather skims through his material. He presents scripts from well known commentators, women newscasters, and sports personalities, and comments on the sample. There is no analysis of just how to write the commentary, or the woman's program, or the sports program. There is too much left unsaid.

This book would be excellent for the man who has had years of news writing experience on smaller stations and has suddenly been offered a position on the network. It would give such a man a very good picture of what he should and should not do in writing news. The author explains very well the

different kinds of news programs. For the beginner—the student of news writing—there is little to recommend it except as a history of radio news writing and a survey of network technique. There is little consideration for the man who is just learning the business of radio news writing. It is as if the writer were trying to build a house by building the roof first. There is very little opportunity for a student to obtain a position in his chosen profession when his learning consists merely of how a network handles newscopy. Years of experience must be acquired before a news writer attains network status. The writer, William F. Brooks, makes only fleeting mention of the problems in writing local news. He gives but one or two examples of how to format a local news program.

The best chapter of the book seems to be the one on "How to Write Straight Radio News." Here, examples of good and bad copy are given, and the author attempts to point out how to avoid bad copy. A comparison is made between the radio story and the newspaper story. The writer then outlines how a radio story should be written. Even this is rather fragmentary because it does not take into consideration the value of words and their sounds.

As a survey of network types of news stories and programs from straight news to television news, and as an explanation of what these different types of programs are, this book can be commended. As a guide to beginners in the art of news writing for radio, it leaves much to be desired.

*University of Florida*

WILLIAM STEIS

EFFECTIVE TALKING IN CONFERENCE. By John Mantle Clapp. New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1948; pp. 138; \$2.50.

This little volume is not the guide to the problems of conference speaking which its title may lead the speech teacher to expect. By "talking in conference" Mr. Clapp means simple "talking to small groups," and his book is in fact another manual of suggestions for the speechmaker.

Mr. Clapp declares that "To learn to talk better you do not want a treatise or a long course of instruction; these generally kill your individuality. You need, instead, First Aids to get you started." His book offers the first aids. Their nature is indicated by chapter headings. First: "The Secret of Success—Talk to the People before You—Don't Deliver a Monologue." Under "The Arch-Enemy—Your Own Preoccupation," Mr. Clapp lumps various faults in speaking. Three basic principles or "controls" are: "Determine Your Message," "Frame Your Message Beforehand," and "Watch Your Listeners and Talk to Them One by One." Concluding chapters give suggestions and exercises for improving bodily action, voice, and language.

Mr. Clapp's book is aimed at the businessman-speaker who might avoid a more thorough text. It is easy reading and its suggestions are sound. But even to one who agrees that the beginning speaker does not need a "treatise" the book seems overly sketchy, incomplete, and, altogether, not up to the standard set by other brief manuals on the subject.

*Marshall College*

B. W. HOPE



**SPEECH CORRECTION METHODS.** By Stanley Ainsworth. New York: Prentice-Hall, Incorporated, 1948; pp. vi-149; \$3.65.

"This Manual," according to its author, "was written to acquaint students, teachers and speech clinicians with a sound, concise plan for organizing and administering a speech correction program." Probably most serious workers in the field have shared with Mr. Ainsworth the feeling that a "basic know-how" is tremendously important, and will find in this book a decidedly articulate and well organized approach to the comparatively new area of speech correction in the public school system.

Certain admonitions, however, are, in this reviewer's opinion, essential in using this book to best advantage. These suggestions are set down in the introduction which should be carefully read at the outset. First of all, this book is a "Manual" and as such should be used with an awareness of the limitations implied in such a specification. It is perhaps unfortunate that the title did not include the word "Manual" in place of "Methods." The author presupposes that the users of the book shall be thoroughly trained in speech pathology and well informed about therapeutic technics. If the "Manual" is used only by individuals who possess such an adequate background in speech correction, it will undoubtedly be a satisfactory "quick reference." However, in its effort to be concise, the book oversimplifies to such a degree in the section on therapy that the suggested technics give this reviewer the impression of recipes, so neat and crisp is their presentation.

The book is divided into two sections. The first part deals with such aspects of public school procedures as, "The Position of the Speech Correctionist in the School System," "Record Keeping," "Survey, Testing and Choice of Cases" and "Speech Improvement Classes." The material in this section lends itself well to the brief, modified outlining arrangement which Mr. Ainsworth has originated. It is the kind of material about which very little has been written and to which the clinician has frequent cause to refer.

The section dealing with methods of therapy has received previous comment in this review. It may, perhaps, be found to be less effective than the first part of the book; clinicians sufficiently trained to administer therapeutic technics should be expected to have methodology completely at their command. In other words, the trained correctionist will find very little use for the sketchy suggestions included in section two.

Such useful information as that involved in report and record keeping, speech correction materials and reading lists are included in the appendix.

This little "Manual" is certainly a very workable contribution to a field which is all too frequently impoverished by a dearth of sound, practical and readily accessible information on vital points.

*University of Virginia*

JULIE R. SPEAKMAN

## NEWS AND NOTES

Charles McGlon of Southern Baptist Theological Seminary and Lester L. Hale of the University of Florida taught four weeks during the summer at the University of Alabama in the Air ROTC Training Program. Their teaching consisted of instructing officers in methods of preparing and presenting materials for classroom instruction. Two other speech men employed in the same program were N. B. Beck of Purdue and Lindsey Perkins of Brooklyn College. T. Earle Johnson of the University of Alabama acted as consultant, giving a number of orientation lectures to the instructional staff.

Dale Welsh of Mississippi State College for Women was Visiting Professor for the summer at the University of Alabama and had charge of the clinic and work in speech correction.

Andrew Erskine, M.A. candidate at the University of Alabama and Technical Director of the Theatre, will return to Muhlenberg College as Director of Dramatics.

Louisiana State University celebrated twenty years of theatre history last spring by doing *Hamlet* which was the 100th major production for the twenty year period. The play was jointly directed by C. L. Shaver and C. M. Wise.

Professor A. Craig Baird of the University of Iowa was the guest lecturer at the annual Speech Institute at Louisiana State University during the summer.

Frank Davis, doctoral candidate at Louisiana State University, has resigned his position at Colorado A & M College to join the staff at Auburn, Alabama. Don Harrington, another doctoral candidate at Louisiana State University, has accepted a position in the speech department at the University of Oklahoma.

Paul Brandes of the University of Mississippi was elected Southern Regional Governor of Tau Kappa Alpha at the Southern Speech Convention in Nashville. At the spring meeting the two Southern Districts, Gulf and South Atlantic, were combined into one southern region.

Howard Townsend of the University of Texas taught at the University of Florida during the summer sessions. He will continue on leave from Texas during the 1948-49 academic year to be a Visiting Professor at Brooklyn College. During the first summer session at the University of Florida he acted as consultant under the direction of H. P. Constans of a workshop to produce with a corps of Florida Speech teachers a complete course of study in speech for the Florida secondary schools. This work was done at the special request and by subsidy of the State Department of Education. During the second summer session Dr. Townsend taught one course in methods of teaching speech in schools and one in public speaking.

Robert Dierlam, Ph.D., Cornell, has joined the speech department of the University of Florida. Dr. Dierlam will serve as Technical Director of the theatre and will also teach interpretation. Before completing his work at Cornell he taught at Illinois Wesleyan College and the University of Colorado. Another member added to the staff at the University of Florida is William B. Steis, graduate of Notre Dame University, who has had thirteen years'

experience in commercial radio. Roy E. Tew will continue on leave from Florida for another year working on his doctorate at Ohio State University in voice science and hearing.

Delwin B. Dusenbury, Theatre Director at the University of Florida, has been elected President of the National Collegiate Players.

Jack Mills, M.A., University of Florida, has accepted a full-time teaching position at the University of Illinois and will begin work on his doctorate in September at Illinois.

A number of graduate assistantships and part-time instructorship appointments have been made at the University of Florida. A partial list of people appointed, all of whom will pursue graduate work is as follows: Russell Bagley, St. Petersburg Junior College, theatre and radio; Sara Ann McBride, Linfield College, Oregon, women's debate; Ralph Neale, Yale, public address; Donald Nelson, Michigan Central College, public address and debate; Glenn Reddick, Colorado State College of Education, Greeley, public address and debate; and Charles Reed, Arkansas State Teacher's College, theatre.

H. P. Constans, University of Florida, has been appointed Chairman of the National Tau Kappa Alpha Committee on Wachtel Awards. The chief task of his committee will be to make annual awards totalling hundreds of dollars to outstanding student speakers in Tau Kappa Alpha throughout the nation.

A number of changes have been made in the speech department at Florida State University at Tallahassee. Mrs. Mary Buford, Head of the Department for many years, has retired. The new head of the department will be Charles Edney, Ph.D., Iowa. Other members added to the faculty are Dr. Frank Fowler, Columbia, in theatre, formerly at the University of Kentucky, and Gilbert Tolhurst, Ph.D., Iowa, in speech correction. Christine Drake and Elizabeth Thompson, who have been on the staff, will continue in their positions.

George Harbold, M.A., University of Florida, has resigned his position at Marshall College to accept a graduate assistantship to work for the doctorate at the University of Missouri.

Irving C. Stover of J. B. Stetson University completed last year his 40th year of service at that institution. At the spring meeting of the Florida Speech Association recognition and tribute was made to him in the form of a body of resolutions.

Roger Boyle, Theatre Director of the University of Virginia, was the summer director of the Paul Green Drama-Pageant, *The Common Glory*, presented nightly from July until September in the open-air theatre at Williamsburg, Virginia.

Douglas Ehninger, book review editor for the *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, recently of Ohio State University, and who has taught at George Washington, Purdue, and Western Reserve, has joined the speech department at the University of Virginia. He has completed all the work for the doctorate at Ohio State University except the dissertation.

The University of Virginia, together with the Virginia Drama Association, inaugurated the Summer Session of Theatre Arts and is making plans for the

continuation of the program in successive years. One aspect of the program was seven theatre courses, namely: Playwriting, Play Production, Acting, Stage Design, Directing, and two courses in Contemporary Drama. In addition a schedule of six full-length productions was set up during the eight weeks. The productions running from three to four nights were: *My Sister Eileen*; *My Heart's in the Highlands*; *Years' Ago*; *Candida*; *The Little Foxes*; and *The Twins*. In addition to the services of Johnny Walker of the University staff, the following were guest directors: Natalie White, George Washington University; Albert E. Johnson, Ph.D., Cornell, who has joined the drama faculty at the University of Texas; J. P. Milhouse, Virginia Polytechnic Institute; and Technical Directors Wilbur Dorsett, Rollins College; and Arthur Early, University of Virginia Bureau of School and Community Drama.

**THE CONSTITUTION  
OF THE SOUTHERN SPEECH ASSOCIATION**  
(As amended and adopted by the Eighteenth Annual Convention  
April 9, 1948)

**ARTICLE I. *Name.***

The name of this Association shall be The Southern Speech Association.

**ARTICLE II. *Officers.***

Section 1. The officers of this Association shall be President, First Vice-President, Second Vice-President, Third Vice-President, Executive Secretary, and Editor of Publications. The terms of office of the Editor and of the Executive Secretary shall be set so as not to terminate at the same time.

Section 2. The First Vice-President shall automatically succeed to the office of President upon the expiration of the President's term of office.

Section 3. The First Vice-President shall succeed the President, should the President's office become vacant through death, resignation, or disability. The Executive Council shall have authority to fill any other vacancy created by the death, resignation, or disability of an elected officer of the Association.

**ARTICLE III. *Executive Council.***

The Executive Council shall consist of:

- (1) The elected officers of the Association;
- (2) A representative from each of the affiliated State Speech Associations, to be elected by the State Association for the term of two years;
  - (a) The representatives from the following-named states shall be elected in *even-numbered years*:

Texas, Arkansas, Florida, Virginia, Kentucky, Louisiana,  
Mississippi.
  - (b) The representatives from the following-named states shall be elected in *odd-numbered years*:

North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Georgia, Alabama,  
West Virginia.
- (3) The President, Executive Secretary, and Editor, each for one year following the expiration of his term of office.

**ARTICLE IV. *The Advisory Board.***

An advisory Board, consisting of the Immediate Past President and three members elected by the Executive Council for a term of three years each with staggered terms of office, shall assist the President in determining policy and as otherwise needed.

**ARTICLE V. *Duties of Officers.***

Section 1. The President shall perform the following-named duties and such other related duties as shall arise:

- A. Prepare the program for the Annual Convention.
- B. Preside at all business meetings of the Association and the Executive Council.
- C. Appoint and notify all committees except those otherwise provided for.
- D. See that the members of the profession receive notice of meetings and activities of the Association and of the Council unless the transmission of such notice has been otherwise assigned.

Section 2. The Vice-Presidents.

A. First Vice-President shall perform the following-named duties and such other related duties as shall arise.

1. Assist the President in the preparation of the program for the Annual Convention.
2. Contact State Associations in compiling lists of officers, members, and all other speech teachers in the state.
  - a. These lists to be placed in the hands of the Executive Secretary.
  - b. The corrected lists of state officers to be furnished to the Editor of the *Journal* for each issue.
3. Serve as liaison officer between State Associations and the Southern Speech Associations.

B. The Second Vice-President shall perform the following-named duties and such other related duties as shall arise:

1. Endeavor to gain added recognition from State Departments of Education for speech work done in high schools, colleges and universities.
2. Foster and encourage speech work at the elementary level.

C. The Third Vice-President shall supervise all extra-curricular activities of the Association. Specifically he shall:

1. Be charged with the planning and operation of the Annual Tournament and Congress.
2. Select a director of the Congress and/or Tournament, subject to the approval of the President of the Association.
3. Endeavor to serve as a clearing house in the scheduling of tournaments, congresses, and festivals.

Section 3. The Executive Secretary shall perform all the ordinary duties of the Secretary and the Treasurer of the Association. As Treasurer he shall furnish a financial report to each Annual Convention. The Executive Secretary shall incorporate into his report a financial accounting covering all publications.

Section 4. The Editor shall direct and supervise the publications of the Association as authorized by the Executive Council.

Section 5. An Advertising Manager, appointed by the Executive Secretary and Editor, shall perform the duties connected with the procuring of advertising for *The Southern Speech Journal*.

ARTICLE VI. *Membership.*

Section 1. Membership in this Association shall be open, upon application, to any teacher of speech or other person interested in speech activities, upon payment of the current annual dues.

Section 2. Other persons may be elected to membership by a majority vote of the Association.

ARTICLE VII. *Amendments.*

This Constitution and By-Laws may be amended at any meeting of the Association by two-thirds of the votes cast.

## BY-LAWS

ARTICLE I. *Election of Officers.*

Section 1. The officers shall be elected by the Association at each convention. Nominations for this election shall be made by a Nominating Committee of five, chosen in the following-described manner: Without nominations from the floor, tellers appointed by the President shall distribute blank ballots on which each voter shall place the names of five members of the Association who are eligible to serve on the Nominating Committee. No ballot containing more or fewer than five members shall be counted. The five members receiving the largest number of votes shall be declared elected, except that while the names of more than one person from the same school may be placed on any ballot, only one person from a given school shall be permitted membership on the Committee. (In the counting of the ballots, consequently, all persons from a given school, except the one among them with the highest plurality, shall be dropped from consideration.) Any ties in the voting shall be broken by the President. The Nominating Committee shall be elected at the first business meeting of the Convention and shall report at the first business meeting of the Convention held the following year. Of the complete elected Committee, the member with the largest plurality, shall be chairman. The Nominating Committee shall propose one or more names for each office. Before proceeding to a ballot, the President shall call for additional nominations from the floor.

Section 2. The President and Vice-President shall be elected for a term of one year.

Section 3. The Editor and Executive Secretary shall be elected for terms of three years each.

ARTICLE II. *Dues.*

Section 1. These dues shall be one dollar and fifty cents (\$1.50) per annum, *payable in advance*.

Section 2. A sustaining membership fee of five dollars (\$5.00) shall be acceptable to cover membership in this Association, the Convention registration fee, and such publications and privileges as the Executive Council shall grant.

Note: (At present this includes the subscription to the *Western Speech Journal* and the Convention fee.)

Section 3. A Convention fee of one dollar (\$1.00) shall be assessed from each person registered at the Convention; however, all undergraduate students and high school students are privileged to attend upon payment of a registration fee of fifty cents (\$.50); furthermore, all students enrolled in Tournaments and Congresses of the Association shall be admitted to the Convention free of charge.



-  
s  
s  
n  
g  
g  
e  
y  
n  
n  
l  
y  
t  
-  
-  
e  
n  
f  
y  
e  
n  
s  
s  
e

2